uiniſts who coyne no new diſtinctions, for truth is alwaies the ſame.

The 5. propertie.

The 5. propertie of truth is that it is ſubiect to perſecution, *Obſequium amicos veritas odium parit. Friends are the children of flatterie, & hatred is begotten by harmeleſſe truth.* Peruſe the whole booke of God, nay all hiſtories and thou ſhalt finde this thing moſt clearely confirmed: what then cauſed Bellarmine to teach that temporall proſperitie is a note of the church: Chriſt and his Apoſtles are much beholding to him, who ſuffred exquiſite torments and therefore by his diuinitie are to bee exempted from the number of Gods Saints, but they that haue better learned Chriſt hold otherwiſe. Now to returne to the matter, haue not the Papiſts bin drunken with the blood of Gods Saints: ſo I come to the ſixt and laſt property of truth.

Read the booke of Martyrs.

The 6. Propertie.

Id verum quodcunque primum, id adulterinum quodcunque poſterius: That is true which is firſt, that is adulterous which is an

Tertullian adu. Prax.

A *Disswasive* FROM POPERIE CONTAINING TWELVE EFFECTVAL REASONS, BY VVHICH EVERY Papist, not wilfully blinded, may be brought to *the truth, and euery Protestant confirmed* in the same: written by *Francis Dillingham Master of Arts, and fellow of* Christs Colledge in Cambridge, *necessarie for all men in* these times.

Lactant. lib. de vero dei simulachro. cap. 20.

Quid facies? maiores ne, an potius rationē sequeris?
What wilt thou doe? follow thy ancestours, or reason?

PRINTED BY IOHN LEGAT,
Printer to the Vniuersitie of Cambridge. 1599.

Th.
8° D. 7
BS

A

The ſumme of the booke.

1 The firſt reaſon of Antichriſt.
2 The ſecond of truth.
3 Of hæreſie in generall.
4 Of particular hæreſies.
5 Of popiſh diſſolute, and diſcomfortable doctrine.
6 Of Idolatrie.
7 Of popiſh blaſphemies.
8 Of the Papiſts owne confeſsion.
9 The ninth, of the Practiſe of the primitiue Church.
10 Of Scripture.
11 Of popiſh Contradictions.
12 Of the originall of Poperie.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA
DOMINUS ILLUMINATIO MEA

TO THE *right Honorable, and my* very good Lord, *Oliver* L. *S. Iohn, Baron of* Bletsoe, *Grace, and* peace, with increase of *honour, &c.*

IT is not vnknown (Right honourable and my singular good Lord) that man is not borne for himselfe, but for the benefit of others. To this principle agreeth the *Apostles* precept, *that euery man according to his gift, should indeauour himselfe to do good.* Rom. 12. 1. Pet. 4. 10. And to this precept, the practise of nature is answerable: *Vt luna* (saith Erasmus) *quod luminis accepit à sole mundo refundit: ita donum à deo acceptum in commodum aliorum* in Similia d.

est conferendum. As the moone giueth that light to the world which it receiueth from the sunne: so euery gift receiued from God ought to be bestowed to the profit of others. All which excellent sayings, are spoken of euery good, and therefore by consequent of knowledge, of which *Seneca* writeth thus: *Nulla me res delectabit licet eximia sit, quã mihi vnus sciturus sum. I delight not in any thing, which I my selfe know and none other.* And againe: *Nullius boni sine socio iucunda possessio est. It is no pleasure to possesse any good without a companion.* The consideration of these and like speaches, haue caused me to set pen to paper, against the mysticall and secret impietie of Popish religion, although vnfit for so great a worke in many respects; as namely in regard of my health. For I may truly say with *Seneca*, *Nulla mihi secura lux affulsit, I haue had no good day.* This beeing a most certen truth, how vnable I am to vndergoe this business, the similitude vsed by *Tully* may declare. *Quemadmodum scalarum gradus si alios tollas, alios in- nonnullos malè hærentes relinquas, ru-*

In Tbebaid.

ina

inæ periculum struas, non ascensum pares, sic tot malis tùm victum, tùm fractum studium scribendi quid dignum auribus, aut probabile potest afferre. If thou take some rounds of the ladder away, and cut other, and leaue the rest loose, thou endangerest a downefall, and causest not an ascension: so the endeauour of writing beeing vanquished with so many miseries, what thing cã it bring forth worthie, and worth hearing and reading. This miserie hath another attendant, namely *pouertie* and *want*, which (as one saith) *is onus miserum, & graue*, a woful and a grieuous burthen. The renowmed Philosopher could say that felicity needed outward good things. For, Ἀδύνατον, ἢ οὐ ῥᾴδιον τὰ καλὰ πρᾶττειν ἄνευ ἐχορηγίας τινὸς ὄντα. *It is impossible, or very hard for him that wanteth instruments to doe any famous works.* But not too much of this matter, least I seeme to be impatient, being my selfe a preacher of patience. Onely this, I feare that the cause, why many are peruerted by Papists, and diuerted to poperie, is the hope of preferment, which is not wanting in that religion. *Sublatis studio-*

Ethic. 1. 8.

rum pretijs ipsa studia pereunt, (saith Cornelius Tacitus) *Take away the rewardes of learning, and learning it selfe decaieth.* But I leaue this complaint beeing a miserie incident to the despised estate of Gods Church in the sight of the world, howsoeuer most glorious in the sight of God. Thus (Right Honourable) you see the cause that mooued me to set forth this treatise. Now in that I dedicate it vnto you, I haue many reasons. For (to omit priuate respects, as namly your honourable and singular fauour towardes me, and all my friendes) such is your desire to further Christs kingdome, such is your care of religion, your loue to learning, that for these causes you are most worthie of this dutie. And in these singular and admirable graces of Gods spirit may you more reioyce then in any worldly thing. *Aristotle* (as *Plutarch* writeth) writte to *Antipater* concerning *Alexander*, that he should not be proud because of his kingdome, because he that knewe God, hath as much cause as he: his meaning is this, that the knowledge of God is better then worldly honour.

Annal. l. 11.

The Lord blesse you and your wife, vertuous, and honourable Ladie with all heauenly and worldly honour.

Your L. euer bounden

Francis Dillingham.

A preface to all English Papistes whatsoeuer.

Rhe. act. 11.

IT is not my purpose to vse any long discourse vnto you, that please your selues in the name of Papists, yet I pray you let me first craue an answer to this my dissuasiue, or els submit your selues to gods truth. Secondly, I would bee certified vvhat should cause you to continue in the Romish religion. Doth the vniuersalitie of which you vvere wont to vaunt your selues? why then doe your Rhemists in their annotations vppon the 20. chap. of the Reuel. proue the Pope not to bee Antichrist, because his kingdome is daily lessened, and Antichrist during the time of his raigne shalbe greater then Christs flock? yea some of you haue vvritten that the Church in his time shall vtterly perish as your selues know. Againe if vniuersality chalketh out the church, why did the Arrian Emperour say to Liberius, Quota pars tu es orbis terrarum,

Theodoret. lib. 2. cap. 16.

qui

qui solus facis cum homine scelerato, & orbis terrarum, & mundi totius pacem dissoluis? What part of the world art thou that onely takest part with the wicked man, and dissolvest the peace of the whole earth? Liberius *answereth*, Non diminuitur solitudine mea verbum fidei, nam & olim tres soli fuere qui edicto resisterent. In that I am left alone the word of faith is not diminished, for in times past there were onely three that resisted the kings edict. *But it may be your vnitie is of some force with you: for your satisfaction in this point, see my motiue of your dissentions. Also consider that ther may be some diuersitie of opinions in lesser matters, and yet a true church, for els the auncient Christians should haue beene no church, amongst whome there vvere many dissentions, as you may see in the 8. booke of the tripartite historie, and 12. chap.* Themistius *wrote to* Valens *that he should not be cruell to the Christians,* Propter discordiam Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum: for the variance of Ecclesiastical opinions. *For amongst the Pagans there vvere more then three hundred sects. To come now*

to

to succession, doth not Bellarmine *your* Pythagoras *teach that it prooueth not alwaies a church. Secondly, Atheists, Heretikes, Sorcerers, and a woman haue beene Pope, and that interrupteth your succession. Thirdly, your plurality of Popes, during your two and twenty schismes disanulleth the same. Lastly, many Popes haue not beene Canonically elected. To proceed to antiquitie, see your selues stripped of it in this my treatise: and yet you are not greatly vvise men so alleadge bare antiquitie: for as* Lactantius *saieth in his 2. booke and 7. chap.* Tanta est apud insipientes authoritas vetustatis, vt in eam inquirere scelus esse ducatur. Amongst fooles antiquitie hath that authoritie, that it is counted a hainous thing to inquire into it. *Lastly concerning your miracles, I say with* Augustine *in his booke,* de vnitate Ecclesiæ cap. 16. *Let them not say it is true, because* Donatus, *or* Pontius, *or any other man hath done these, & these miracles: Againe, whether they hold the church or no let them shew, no otherwise, but by the Canonical bookes of holy Scriptures. I will not spend any time in painting out of the odious and infa-*

mous

mous lifes of Papists: but come to a conclusion namely that seing those thinges that they were wont to bragge of, are taken from them, let them embrace the truth, let not the world seduce them against their owne consciences. For what are vngodly rich men, but (as Plutarch *saith*) asini ligna ferentes, asses bearing burdens. *The Lord open your eyes to see the truth.*

To

ALthough I had many motiues to set forth this my treatise in latin, yet regarding the good of those that are ignorant in that tongue, I haue written it in English, with as much shortnes and breuitie as I could possibly. I confesse I might haue made a great volume of it, if I had insisted vpon the amplification of euery reason: but for diuerse respects, I haue comprehended it in this small manuall. And as I haue disswaded men from popery by these twelve seuerall reasons, so did I once thinke to haue adioyned more, but for causes known to my selfe, I haue yet concealed them. Their senseless paradoxes, and witlesse arguments, with which their bookes are fraught, haue caused me so to abhorre their religion, that I may protest in simplicitie of a good conscience, I could neuer read any argument to perswade me to papistrie: yet haue I read their writers without any præiudicate opinion at all, being neuer foreſtalled

ſtalled with this religion, in which through Gods grace nowe I ſtand. And Bellarmines corrupting of fathers, his fooliſh diſtinctions, his cõtradictions with himſelfe, & with other Papiſts, his ſenceleſſe ſophiſmes, his wreſting of holy writte, haue in them (as I thinke) this force to perſwade his readers from his religion. Now it remaineth (Chriſtian reader) to deſire this of thee, to weigh theſe my motiues with an indifferent mind, and if thou receiueſt any good by them, to be thankefull to God, and to commend me in thy praiers vnto him.

Catalogus authorum.

Alcoranus franciscanorum.
Alexander de Ales.
Alphonsus de castro.
Ambrosius.
Aquinas.
Arias montanus.
Arnobius.
Augustinus.
Bellarminus.
Bernardus.
Buckingerus.
Catalogus testiũ veritatis.
Censura Colonienſis.
Catechismus Coloniensis.
Clemens Alexandrinus.
Chrysosthomus.
Cusanus.
Cyprianus.
Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus.
Dureus.
Durandus.
Epiphanius.
Erasmus.
Euripides.
Eusebius.
Fasciculus temporum
Freculphius.
Gratianus.
Gregorius Episcopus Romanus.
Gregorius Nazianzenus.
Gregorius Martinus.
Hentenius.
Herbranaus.
Hierom.
Hugo Cardinalis.
Index expurgatorius.
Irenæus.
Iuellus.
Iustinus.

Lactantius.
Lombardus.
Lyra.
Macrobius.
Maierius.
Mathæus Paris.
Melchior Canus.
Origines.
Picus Mirandula.
Plautus.
Polidorus Virgilius.
Psalterium Romanũ.
Rhemenses.
Roffensis.
Ruffinus.
Scotus.
Sleidan.
Socrates.
Tertullianus.
Tullius.
Turrianus.
Wolfgangus Hermãnus.
Zozomenus.

Lactantius. Rhemenses.
Lombardus. Rossensis.
Lyra. Russinus.
Macrobius. Scotus.
Maierius. Sleidan.
Matheus Paris. Socrates.
Melchior Canus. Tertullianus.
Origines. Tullius.
Picus Mirandula. Turrianus.
Plautus. Wolfgangus Hermanus.
Polidorus Virgilius.
Psalterium Romanū. Zozomenus.

THE FIRST REASON of Antichriſt.

IN times paſt (Chriſtiã Reader) the queſtion was whether Chriſt appointed the Pope to be heade of this church, but now (bleſſed be God) it is not without cauſe demanded, whether he be *Antichriſt* or no. From which as the title of *ſervus ſervorum*, that is, the ſeruant of ſeruants, will not excuſe him, beeing indeed the title of curſed *Cham*, and ſo fit in Gods iuſt prouidence for the man of ſinne: ſo theſe circumſtances following beeing laide together will firmely conclude the ſame.

The 1. Circumſtance.

Antichriſtianiſme is a myſterie, 2. Theſſ. cap. 2. τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας,

 that is,

is, *The myſterie of iniquity doth now worke:* out of which place of holy writte, I argue, that neither the open blaſphemous hæretiks, nor the Turke can be that Antichriſt, becauſe they are not diſſembled, but plaine and open enimies to Chriſt. Yet as *Hierom* ſaith on the 24. chapter of Mathew, *Omnis Hæreſiarchia eſt Antichriſtus.* Euery Arch-hæritike is Antichriſt, but not *Antichriſt* κατ' ἐξοχὴν, that is, that ſingular Antichriſt. Maruell not then though all men perceiue & vnderſtand him (namely the Pope) not to be that Antichriſt ſeeing it is a myſterie: for as fewe knowe the Goſpell becauſe it is a myſterie, ſo likewiſe little is the flocke to which this *Antichriſt* is revealed: pray therefore with Dauid to open thine eyes, that thou maiſt behold the ſecrets of God: for as Auguſtine ſaith, *Qui didicerunt à Domino Ieſu eſſe humiles & mites in corde plus proficiunt orando quàm audiendo & legendo*; that is, *They that have learned of Chriſt meekeneſſe of minde, and humility of heart, profit more by prayer, then by hearing and reading.*

Epiſtola 112.

the

The second Circumstance.

Antichrist is not called ἀντίθεος, an aduersary to God, although he doth band himselfe against him, but ἀντίχριστος, that is, an aduersary to Christ in æmulatiõ of like honour. For he arrogateth to himselfe those things that are propper to Christ, as namely remissiõ of sinnes, which I prooue out of Bernard, who saith, *Vnde scimus quòd Christus potest dimittere peccata? quia deus est. vnde scis quod deus est? miracula probant.* That is, *Howe do we knowe that Christ can remit sinnes? because he is God. How dost thou knowe he is God? his miracles prooue the same.* Out of which testimony I frame this syllogisme: he that remitteth sinnes is god: but the pope remitteth sinnes, therefore he is god: and by consequẽt Antichrist. 11. sermon ad Milites.

The third Circumstance.

Those things which the Papists write concerning Antichrist are ridiculous. First the Rhemists say and affirme that he shall come of the tribe of Dan, which opinion Bellarmine strongly refuteth by this reason: Namely, because the tribes are so confoun-

ded, that no man can say this man is of this or that Tribe.

Secondly, they say Antichrist shall be the Iewes Messias, but he must spring of the tribe of Iudah: *ergo*, Antichrist the Iewes Messias cannot descend of Dan.

Thirdly, they teach he shall be one singuler man, which is vnpossible: for it is written in the second to the Thes. 2. cap. vers. 7. *The mysterie of iniquity now worketh*, but he that worketh from that time till the comming of Christ is no singular man: *ergo* Antichrist is not one singular man.

The further proofe of this, that he is not one singular man, Saint Iohn saith: 1. Ioh. 2. 22. *Who is a liar but he that denyeth that Iesus is Christ: the same is Antichrist that denieth the father and the sonne: euery one that denieth the sonne hath not the father.* This note as it doth agree to all hæretiks, so principally to the Pope, who denieth the offices of Christ, as other hæretickes haue done his person. Read the 2. of Iohn and the 7. verse: also the 4. of Iohn & the thrid verse, Ireneus saith it is a kingdom. *Lib.* 5.

Fur-

Fourthly, they teach that he ſhall raigne but three yeres and a halfe, which Hentenius a papiſt in his preface to his tranſlation of Arethas ouerthroweth, ſaying, *it is unpoſſible that Antichriſt in ſo ſhort time ſhould obtaine ſo many kingdomes and prouinces.* Secondly Chriſt his comming to iudgement ſhall be known ſo ſoone as Antichriſt is reuealed, for if he ſhall be ſlaine of Chriſt, then it will be eaſie to caſt the time of three yeres & a halfe, & ſo conſequently to tell the very houre of Chriſt his cõming to iudgement.

Fiftly, they teach he ſhall ſit at Hieruſalem which is ouerthrowen and is not eaſily reedified. 2. it cannot be called the temple of God. 3. The Rhemiſtes themſelues out of Auguſtine encline to thinke that he ſhall not ſit there: but more of this in the 4 circũſtãce.

The fourth circumſtance.

Antichriſt ſhall ſit in the Church of God, 2. Theſſ. 2. cap. verſ. 4. So ſaith ſaith ſaint Hierom. *Antichriſtus ſedebit in Eccleſia Dei.* 11. Epiſt. quæ. alga. *Antichriſt ſhall ſit in the church of God,* not in the true Church, but that which is ſo called, by which the argument of Bellarmine is

anſwered, who goeth about to prooue by this circumſtance that the church of Rome is the true church.

The 5. Circumſtance.

Gregorius lib. 4. epiſ. 34. *Quicunque ſe vniuerſalem Epiſcopum appellat is Antichriſtus eſt. Papa vniuerſalem Epiſcopum ſe appellat: ergo.* whoſoeuer calleth himſelfe vniuerſall Biſhop, hee is Antichriſt, but ſo doth the Pope. *ergo.* And leaſt they ſhould anſwere, that the propoſition is not to bee vnderſtood of the Biſhop of Rome, heare what Gregory ſaith: *Eſt nomen blaſphemiæ*, it is a name of blaſphemie: And again *Petrus non vocatur vniuerſalis Epiſcopus.* Peter is not called vniuerſall Biſhop.

The 6. circumſtance.

In his 38. demonſtration. Antichriſt ſhall ſit at Rome, ſo doeth Sanders confeſſe, and the Rhemiſts doe not contradict this in their Annotations vpon the 5. ver. of the 11. chap. of the Revelation: for the proofe of which I thus ioyne in argument with them. 1. That which was Babilon in S. Iohns time is the ſame that he propheciеth to be the chiefe ſeat of Antichriſt: but Rome was then Babylon: *Ergo* it is the ſame that he prophe-

prophecieth to bee the chiefe ſeate of Antichriſt. 2. The fathers affirme Rome to be Babylon when they wrote: out of which thus I conclude. In the dayes of the Fathers *viz.* Auguſtine, Hierome, &c. Rome was not heatheniſh, but by them it is called the ſeat of Antichriſt, *Ergo* not heatheniſh Rome is the ſeat of Antichriſt.

The 7 Circumſtance.

Papa diſpenſat contra verbum Dei. The Pope diſpenſeth againſt Gods word: Again, *Præcepta moralia ſunt per Eccleſiam mutabilia.* The morall præcepts may bee altered by the church. Further he maymeth the Sacrament in taking the cup from the people, yea the Sacrament which he pretendeth to honour as God is carried before him on an hackney when he rideth on mens ſhoulders: his throne is alſo aboue the altar. In the Iubilie he beateth open the gates of Paradiſe with a golden hammer. The croſſe honoured with diuine honour is caſt at his feete, out of which I conclude he exalteth himſelf aboue God, or at leaſt wiſe maketh himſelfe equall to God: for no lawe can bee diſpenſed

Gratian. 1. par. 1. pag. 76.

with al, but by the same authoritie by which it was made, or by a greater.

The 8. Circumstance.

In the time of Antichrist there shalbe a generall departure from the faith, so doe the Papists themselues confesse. Nowe let vs see whether this Apostasie doeth agree to them or no. To decide this controuersie who is better then Saint Paule who prophecieth of thappostasie. The same Apostle in the first to Timothie, and fourth chapter giueth such euident signes & notes as agree properly vnto them, for they forbid meates and mariages in hypocrisie, other heretikes in open blasphemie: well saieth Saint Hierome vpon the eleuenth of Daniel: *Nota est Antichristi prohibere nuptias. It is a note of Antichrist to forbid mariages.*

Rhem. in the 2. Thess. 2. 7.

The 9. Circumstance.

The ninth Circumstance is taken out of the 13. of the Reuel. from the eleuenth verse, and so forward. Hee is Antichrist that hath two hornes like a lamb, and speaketh like a dragon: Againe he that causeth the earth to worshipp the first beast is Antichrist, also he

that

that doeth worke wonders is Antichrist, with many moe notes and marks, that there follow: but all these doth the Pope, *Ergo* he is Antichrist.

The 10. Circumstance.

Antichrist is called 2. Thess. 2. cap. 3. v. *The man of sin*: which fitly agreeth to the Pope, for what monsters of men haue bin Popes. Silvester was made Pope by the help of the diuell. *Auxilio diaboli factus est Papa.* Iohn the twelth abused his fathers concubine, gelded one of his Cardinalls, drank to the diuel, and at dice called for help of Iupiter and Venus. Boniface the seuenth robbed S. Peters church of al the iewells and pretious things. Read their owne stories because I purpose breuitie. Matthew Paris monke of Saint Albons recordeth that the bishop of Lincolne proued the Pope to bee Antichrist by this reason and writeth thus. Pag. 71. Fasc. Tem. Pag. 1166. & 1168.

Eius auaritiæ totus non sufficit orbis,
Eius luxuriæ meretrix non sufficit omnis.

That is to saye, *The Popes couetousnes and whoredome are not satisfied with the whole world.*

world. To come therefore to a concluſion, I deſire thee (chriſtian Reader) to laye all theſe circumſtances together and ſo to conclude this matter in queſtion whether the Pope be Antichriſt or no: doe not looſely of any one gather any thing, but binde them togither and then there will bee not a three-fold but a tenne-folde corde, which is not eaſily broken.

The ſecond reaſon of truth.

IN handling this motion or reaſon it is not my purpoſe to define or to diſtinguiſh truth, but briefly to ſet downe ſome properties of the ſame which cannot poſsibly agree to Poperie, onely I deſire thee (chriſtian Reader) to pray to Chriſt who is truth that thou mayeſt conceaue and embrace it.

The

The first propertie.

Truth hath this propertie, that it is simple, and needeth not many interpretations and expositions: so saith *Euripides*, ἁπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφυ, κοὐ ποικίλων δεῖται λόγων. But Poperie to defende it selfe vseth many expositions, and yet knoweth not what to hold. For the proofe of this, consider their interpretatiõs of the first word in this short sentence: *this is my bodie.* [d] *Gerson* affirmeth that it signifieth the substance of bread, and [e] *Steuen Gardiner* sometimes thought so also: notwithstanding afterward he changed his minde, and came to *Individuum vagum*, as if Christ had saide, *This* (what it is I cannot tell, but it must needes be somewhat) *is my bodie*. *Occam* and other say the pronoune *this*, must be referred to the bodie of Christ, as if our Sauiour had saide, This my bodie is my bodie. Their glosse resolueth this question on this manner. *Solet quæri quid demonstretur per pronomen, Hoc. It is a common question what is meant by the pronoune, This.* To this demand I say nothing is meant, but it is there put materially without any

Vide rever. Bilson. de Sacram.

[d] *contra Florentium libr. 4.*

[e] *contra Diabolic. sophist.*

in 4. of Sent. dist. 13.

de Conse. dist. 2.

any ſignification at all: thus they turned and toſſed the words of Chriſt, till they brought all that the Lord ſaid at his laſt ſupper to plaine nothing. Duræus and Bellarmine teach that by the word *(this)* is meant the whole ſubſtance which Chriſt had in his hand. I demande then what this ſubſtance was, whether it was bread, or the body of Chriſt: if bread, then there was a figure, if the body of Chriſt, then there muſt be tranſubſtantiation before theſe wordes were pronounced, which plainely fighteth with their fancies. This propertie being cleerely touched, if it pleaſe thee to conſider (gentle reader) the Caluenists expoſitions (as they call them) thou ſhalt find them to be all one: namely *this* ſignifieth, or *this* is a ſigne of my body: let Caroloſtadius and the Lutherans anſwer for themſelues.

Tomo 2.

The ſecond propertie.

The ſecond propertie of truth is that it bluſheth to be hid, ſo ſaith Tertullian, *Nihil veritas erubeſcit niſi ſolummodo abſcondi*, that is, *truth is aſhamed of nothing but of concealing*, and our Sauiour Chriſt ſaith, *whatſoeuer*

Lib. aduerſus Valent.

Math. 10. 27

ſoeuer I ſhew you preach on the houſe toppes: but they hid their traditions from the people, as Bellarmine himſelfe confeſſeth, which argueth that they were not truth. I will not here confute his anſwer to the ſaying of our Sauiour Chriſt, becauſe I ſhall deale with it in the Motiue of Hæreſies. If they retort this propertie againſt vs becauſe our Church was [as they call it] *occulta*, that is, hid for many yeres: I firſt anſwer, that they muſt diſtinguiſh betwixt the time of peace and perſecution: truth in perſecution may be driuen into the wildernesſe, but in peace who knoweth not, but that it ought plainely to be taught. Secondly I anſwer that the *Papiſts* haue alwaies felt our Church (as teſtifieth Reinerus a popiſh Inquiſitour,) & ſo I paſſe to the 3. propertie of truth.

Rom. 12.

Catolog. teſt. veri.

The third propertie.

The third propertie of truth is, that it is *magna & prævalet*, it is great and preuaileth: reade the third of Eſdras for the confirmation of this; where trueth is prooued ſtronger then wine and women; and indeede *Actes* the fift and 39. If it be of God

God, it cannot be destroied: this declareth then most apparantly, that it could not proceede but of some diuine power and supernaturall assistance, that amidst the contradictions and oppositions of so many adversaries, among the whippes, swordes, and tortures, of so bloodie and cruell Caniballs as the *Papists* are, our poore, simple, and feeble congregation should peirce through and augment it selfe strongly, especially if we consider the outward means of this increase where there was nothing to allure or contēt mans nature, nothing gorgeous, nothing delectable, nothing to please or entertaine sensualitie: by which is answered their cauil, that trueth resteth with them because of their great multitudes, for had they not had murthers, sorceries, fornication, and thefts, (which are as I will proove (*God* willing) foure pillars of papistrie) they had neuer come to that primarie: yea who knoweth not that with Cyrus they powre forth *Gold* to their slauish sect by heaps and waight, and not by number and account.

Revel. 9. 21.

The

The fourth property.

The fourth propertie of trueth is to be ſteadfaſt and perpetually like it ſelfe, for which cauſe in the Hebrew tongue it is called *Emeth* of the roote which ſignifieth ſtabilitie, ſo doe the Latines call that *verum* which is immutabile, *& per omnia ſibi ſimile*, immutable and like it ſelfe euery way: but in popery there is no ſteadfaſtneſſe; is not *prima & ſecunda iuſtificatio*, the firſt and ſecond iuſtification a new deuiſe? can any Papiſt reſolue the certenty of Peters ſitting at Roome: read Bellarmine, here he diſagreeth from Onuphrius, and Onuphrius from the reſt of the *Papiſts* in this point, which is the foundation of *Poperie*: & is the greateſt point of *Papiſtrie* ſo vncertaine that they knowe not what to hold? Doth not Allen confeſſe in his booke of purgatorie, that there is no text brought to prooue the ſame which might not be otherwiſe applyed? Nay haue not the Rhemiſts and Bellarmine himſelfe left ſchoole conceipts, and brought in their owne deuiſes, witneſſe their owne writing. Tell me thou learned Catholike who

Cenſura collon. Ex conſilio Tridentii.

who ſucceeded Peter? Tertullian affirmeth, that *Petrus Clementem Epiſcopum Romanorum ordinauit*, that Peter ordained Clemēt Biſhop of Rome. Ireneus placeth next to Peter, Linus, Ancletus, and then Clement. Read Hierom and Auguſtine, and thou ſhalt finde greater diuerſitie. Anſwere me papiſt, howe or with what kinde of worſhip Images are to be honoured; Bellarmine himſelfe is not aſſured of this point, as thou maieſt read in his tractate of Images. Laſtly, (becauſe I cannot be long) anſwere me howe Saints heare our prayers if thou canſt: Bellarmine himſelfe muſt needes yeeld to thee, for he is ignorant of that point, & therefore anſwereth vncertainties, as he doeth in the defenſe of purgatorie beeing preſſed with Theophilactes authority, now making it a part of the hande of God which is a place of all iuſt mens ſoules: and in the next wordes a part of hel. Thus Chriſtian reader like wandering trauellers out of the way, the learnedſt papiſts knowe not where to reſt: yea like drunkards they ſtagger to and fro, but thankes be to God it is not ſo with the Caluiniſts

Lib. de præſ.

Lib. 3.

uiniſts who coyne no new diſtinctions, for truth is alwaies the ſame.

The 5. propertie.

The 5. propertie of truth is that it is ſubiect to perſecution, *Obſequium amicos veritas odium parit. Frienas are the children of flatterie, & hatred is begotten by harmeleſſe truth.* Peruſe the whole booke of God, nay all hiſtories and thou ſhalt finde this thing moſt clearely confirmed: what then cauſed Bellarmine to teach that temporall proſperitie is a note of the church: Chriſt and his Apoſtles are much beholding to him, who ſuffred exquiſite torments and therefore by his diuinitie are to bee exempted from the number of Gods Saints, but they that haue better learned Chriſt hold otherwiſe. Now to returne to the matter, haue not the Papiſts bin drunken with the blood of Gods Saints: ſo I come to the ſixt and laſt property of truth.

Read the booke of Martyrs.

The 6. Propertie.

Id verum quodcunque primum, id adulterinum quodcunque poſterius: *That is true which is firſt, that is adulterous which is an* Tertullian adu. Prax.

after intention: but their opinions are not first but latter deuises: did not the lay people receiue the cup in the Apostles time, no *Papist* although he hath lost his forehead can denie it. To wind this vp in a word: Master Iewell (that reuerend and renowned bishop his challenge in the 27. articles is not answered. *Totis iam triginta annis Catholici omnes Iuello nostro nondum satisfecerunt*, that is, *All the Papists in thirtie yeeres space and vpward haue not satisfied M. Iewell.* And therefore I constantly conclude all these 27. opinions are new and no auncient doctrine thus: they that cannot shew 27. of their opinions in the compasse of six hundred yeares are mainteiners of new doctrin: but the *Papists* cannot do this: therfore they maintaine a new doctrine and by consequence a false doctrine. Now as in the former circumstances of Antichrist, so likewise in these sixe seuerall notes of truth, I desire thee to combine thē, & thou maist be able to maintaine this, that truth is not lodged in the *Popes* breast.

The

The third reason of hæresy in generall.

AS touching the definition of hæresie, I might spend many wordes and much time, but I referre thee to Augustine, & come to particular notes and markes of hæretickes, which I doubt not but most euidently to prooue that they agree to papists after a kind of Excellencie, for so I haue learned to speake by metaphysicall philosophie. *Lib. de vtilitate cred.* *Aristot. in Metap.*

The first note.

The first note or badge of hæreticks is to mayme the sayings of Fathers. The eight Counsell of Constantinople and the eight act hath these wordes. *Non conuenit orthodoxis ita circumtruncatas sanctorum patrum voces deflorare hæreticorum potius hoc proprium est. Is it not meete to mayme the sayings of Fathers, it is the point of hæretiks to doe so.* That the Papists doe mayme the sen- *Counc. 8. Constant. Fuellus act. 4.*

tences of Fathers. I might ſhewe by many examples. Durꝛus in his tenth page citing Auguſtine his teſtimony out of his booke *de fide & operibus*, and the 14. chap. leaueth out theſe words which plainely ouerthrow his defence: namely, *opera ſequũtur iuſtificatum non præcedunt iuſtificandum*, that is, *Works follow him that is iuſtified, they go not before iuſtification.* Harding ſo dealeth with the teſtimony of Gregorie in the article of the popes primacy: but I will conuince them by their owne teſtimony, out of their *Index expurgatorius*, page 11. *Although (ſay they) we make no great account of this booke viz. Bertramius and therefore we would not greatly care, if either it were no where extant, or vtterly loſt: yet ſeeing that in other anciẽt Catholik writers we beare very many errors & extenuate, & excuſe thẽ, yea very often by deviſing ſome pretie ſhift we denie them, and doe faine ſome commodious ſence vnto them, when they are oppoſed againſt vs in diſputations, or in Conflicts with the Aduerſaries, we doe not ſee why Bertram doth not deſerue the ſame equity.* Thus farre the

pa-

papists themselues, whose owne words declare that they are voide of all truth and honestie. What should I speake of Cyprian, who to establish *Peters* primacy is falsified by *Pamelius* contrarie to the auncient edition in print, yea the very argument of the place is directly contrary vnto it.

The second note.

The second note of Hæretickes is, not to stand to onely scriptures, so saith Tertullian, *aufer hæreticis quæ cum ethnicis sapiunt, vt de scripturis solis quæstiones suas sistant, & stare non poterunt: take from the hæretickes that which is common to the heathen with them, that they propound their questions only out of scripture and they cannot stande.* Lib. de resur. rect. carnis. Out of which testimony I reason thus: they that dispute not out of scripture alone, are either hæretickes or Ethnickes, but the *Papists* do no so dispute: *Ergo* they are either Hæretickes or Ethnickes. I will conclude this propertie with the Historie recorded by Master Sleidon in his sixt booke at the

disputation at Berne, when Conradus Tregerus an Augustinian prooued that he must dispute out of nothing but scripture, he by and by fled, and so in that place poperie was destroyed: so Lord, let papistrie perish in euery place.

The third note.

The third note of hæretickes is to accuse the scripture of vncertainty. *Hæreticks* (saith Irænæus) *cum ex scripturis arguũtur, in accusationem ipsarum scripturarum conuertũtur, quasi varie sunt dictæ: & quia non possit ex his inueniri veritas, ab bys qui nesciant traditionem, non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem &c. When they are convicted out of the scriptures, they fall to accusing of the scriptures themselues, as though they were diuersly vttered, and that the trueth could not be found out of them which knowe not the tradition, for that was not deliuered in writing, but by word of mouth.* Besids in the same place he hath these wordes: they accuse the scriptures, *quasi non rectè se habent, neque sunt ex authoritate, as though they were not right and perfect, or*

not

not of authority ſufficient. Whether the papiſts hold not all theſe points mencioned, I appeale to their own conſcience, though I knowe it to be corrupt. Did not Sylueſter affirme that, *ab authoritate papæ vis omnis ſcripturæ pendet, all the authority of the ſcripture dependeth on the pope*? Doth not Cuſanus write that the ſcriptures *vna cum tempore mutantur, are chaunged with time*? Who but Wolfangus Hermãnus blaſphemed, that the ſcriptures without the church, are of no more worth then Aeſops fables? and as touching traditions do not they teach that we haue not the fence of holy writ, becauſe we doe not embrace the truth of their traditions? ſo then gather of all theſe that they are hæretikes, as well as thoſe againſt whome Iræneus did write.

Sleidan. lib. 1. fol. 3.

Epiſt. 2. vid. Whitak. cont. Duræum. p. 161. & 117.

The fourth note.

The fourth note is to conceale their doctrine from the people, *dicunt* (as teſtifieth Iræneus) *nõ opportere ipſorum myſteria effari, ſed in abſcondito contineri per ſilentium: They affirme that their myſteries and ſecrets are not to be vttered, but to be conceа-*

Lib. 1. c. 23.

disputation at Berne, when Conradus Tregerus an Augustinian prooued that he must dispute out of nothing but scripture, he by and by fled, and so in that place poperie was destroyed: so Lord, let papistrie perish in euery place.

The third note.

The third note of hæretickes is to accuse the scripture of vncertainty. *Hæreticks* (saith Irænæus) *cum ex scripturis arguũtur, in accusationem ipsarum sciptur arum conuertũtur, quasi varie sunt dictæ: & quia non possit ex his inueniri veritas, ab bijs qui ne sciant traditionem, non enim per litteras traditam illam, sed per viuam vocem &c. When they are conuicted out of the scriptures, they fall to accusing of the scriptures themselues, as though they were diuersly vttered, and that the trueth could not be found out of them which knowe not the traditon, for that was not deliuered in writing, but by word of mouth.* Besids in the same place he hath these wordes: they accuse the scriptures, *quasi non rectè se habent, neque sunt ex authoritate, as though they were not right and perfect, or*

not

not of authority ſufficient. Whether the papiſts hold not all theſe points mencioned, I appeale to their own conſcience, though I knowe it to be corrupt. Did not Sylueſter affirme that, *ab authoritate papæ vis omnis ſcripturæ pendet, all the authority of the ſcripture dependeth on the pope?* Doth not Cuſanus write that the ſcriptures *vna cum tempore mutantur, are chaunged with time?* Who but Wolfangus Hermãnus blaſphemed, that the ſcriptures without the church, are of no more worth then Aeſops fables? and as touching traditions do not they teach that we haue not the fence of holy writ, becauſe we doe not embrace the truth of their traditions? ſo then gather of all theſe that they are hæretikes, as well as thoſe againſt whome Iræneus did write.

Sleidan. lib. 1. fol. 3.

Epiſt 2. vid. Whitak. cont. Duræum. p. 161 & 117.

The fourth note.

The fourth note is to conceale their doctrine from the people, *dicunt* (as teſtifieth Iræneus) *nõ opportere ipſorum myſteria effari, ſed in abſcondito contineri per ſilentium: They affirme that their myſteries and ſecrets are not to be vttered, but to be conceaLib. 1. c. 23.*

led. which is directly contrarie to our sauiour Christ his wordes, who commaundeth those thinges which he taught to be published on the house toppes, to which place Bellarmine answereth, *si opus est, if it be needefull.* I doubt not but if he had beene furnished with a better answer, we should haue had it, but pardon errour which hath but figge leaues to hide her filthinesse: may not the Atheist say, when he is commanded to beleeue, and keepe gods commandemēts, *si opus est, If it be requisite I will doe them.* To shewe nowe that the papists conceale their secrets from the people is needelesse, seeing it is confessed by Bellarmine in his tractate of Traditions. And why is their seruice in an vnknown tongue? why are the scriptures forbidden the laye people, but to hide their errors: so that I may fitly cōpare the Romish religion to the temples of Aegypt, which without were deckt with gold, but within had most loathsome sights.

Matt. 10. 27.

De trad.

Clem. Alex. lib. 3. cap. 2.

The 5. note

The fift note is, to vaunte and to boast themselues of their pretended and falsely called

led knowledge, 1. Tim. 6. 20. *dicunt se* [saith Iræneus] *non solum presbyteris, sed etiam Apostolis existentes sapientiores synceram inuenisse veritatem: they say that beeing wiser then the auncient and Apostles, they haue found out the syncere truth.* This note is so euidently eminent in all hæreticks that the Rhemists themselues haue made made it a badge of an hæreticke; but howe shall we proove that the papists like empty vessels make the lowdest & the greateſt ſoũd. The maker of their Apologie doth it for me aduance their fellowes in this insolent mãner. *Our wits*, saith he, *are from God in as plentifull manner as theirs, our foundation in all kinde of faculties requisite for the studie of Diuinitie is as deeply laid as theirs; our diligence rather more then theirs: our times both for age and studie more complete, then theirs commonly can be: Our order, method, and course of Diuinity much more profitable then theirs: we haue more disputations, lessons, conferences, examinations, repetitions instructions, catechizings, resolutions of cases both of conscience, and controuersie: methods*

Lib. 1. Tim. 6. Cap. 5.

thods and manners to proceed to the conuersi-on of the deceiued, and such like exercises in our two Colledges, then they in their two Vniuersities containing neere hand 30. goodly Colleages, as for the Masters and Professours in our Colledges specially the Romane readers, we may be bold to say they be in all kinde the most choyse and cunning men in al Christendome for vertue, learning, &c. Would not this odious and arrogant comparison rather beseeme boies in the schoole, then diuines in the church: thus the Papists themselues haue made both the proposition and assumption, so that if so bee they bee not wilfully blinde, they may inferre the conclusion.

The 6. Note.

The 6. note is to refuse the common name of Christians and to choose themselues seuerall names. Hierom *in dialogo contra Lucifer: Si ubi audieris eos qui dicuntur Christi non à domino Iesu sed ab alio nũcupari, vt puta Marcionitas, Valentinianos, scito non Ecclesiam Christi esse sed Antichristi synagogam. If thou heares any where such as bee*

said

ſaid to be of Chriſt, not to haue their names of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt (as Marcionites, Valentinians,) knowe thou that they belong not to the Church of Chriſt, but to the ſynagoge of Antichriſt. Haue not the Papiſts peculiar names as Dominicans, Franciſcans, Ieſuites, Thomiſtes and Scotiſtes maintaining al one grand hereſie of Poperie: yet hauing their diuerſe opinions among themſelues & each ſect enuying other, and ſwelling againſt the other, which cauſed Anſelmus as Heerbrandus reporteth to break out into this ſpeach. *Quis non contemnat religionem tot varietatibus ſubiectam: Who would not deſpiſe a religion ſubiect to ſo many ſects.*

The 7. Note.

The heretikes in all ages haue by allegories vpholden their errours, and allegories haue bin their ſtrõgeſt inſtruments to work withall. Epiphanius maketh mention of a beaſtly kinde of heretikes, who by allegories defended the ſinne of the Sodomites not onely as a thing that might be ſuffred, but as a duetie that muſt be done, moſt ſhamefully racking to the defence of that ſhameles opi-

nion

nion theſe wordes of Chriſt. *Verely I ſay*
Matt.5.26. *vnto thee, thou ſhalt not come out thence till thou haſt paid the vttermoſt farthing* φασὶ γὰρ ὅτι ὅσα νομίζεται παρ' ἀνθρώποις κακὰ εἶναι, οὐ κακὰ ὑπάρχει, ἀλλὰ φύσει καλά, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔστι φύσει κακόν. that is, *they ſay that what ſoeuer are thought euill amongſt men, are not euill indeed, but naturally good, for nothing is naturally euill.* The heretiks called *Priſcillianiſtæ* did auoid by allegorizing whatſoeuer was brought
August.de Here. againſt them, *In ſuos ſenſus allegorizando vertunt quicquid in ſanctis libris eſt quod eorum euertat errorem: vvhatſoeuer is found in the Scripture that ouerthrovveth their errours, by an allegoricall expoſition they make it to maintaine the ſame.* So do the Anabaptiſtes and Familiſtes now in our daies. As for the Papiſtes haue not they plucked their purgatorie out of the ſame text aboue named by an Allegorie? Doe not they prooue their free-will by allegorizing the parable in the tenth chapter of S. Luke, which is concerning the man halfe dead. By which wee ſee it common to heretikes and not peculiar to any one

by

by allegories to abuse the holie Scriptures, to be abbetors of their absurdities. Many moe places might I haue alleadged out of the Papistes to prooue this, but the trueth is so cleare and manifest that they cannot denie it. *Vide Dur. de sopis.*

The 8. Note.

The eight note is to enioyne the lay people those things that are to bee performed by the Ministers. *Laicis sacerdotalia iniungunt; ipsæ mulieres hæreticæ quàm procaces quæ audent tingere, ordinationes eorum leues & inconstantes &c. they command the people priests, duties, their women are so bold as to baptize, their ordinations of ministers are light and inconstant.* These properties doe liuely paint out the Papistes. Their Mid-wiues vse to baptize, their ordinations and consecrations are they not of the baseſt of the people. I would wee had not had experience of this cursed practise of Ieroboam. *Tertul. lib. de præscrip.*

Ordo sacerdotum fatuo turbatur ab omni: Labitur, & passim Religionis honos.

Euery foole with the Papists are priested.

by

by which religiõ commeth to ruine, nay I dare avouch, that they haue conſecrated ſhriuelings that are not borne *ad Aram*, but *ad Haram*, not to ſerue at the altar, but at the ſwine-ſtie. Here I might haue added moe properties of heretiks confeſſed by the Rhe-
Vpon Iud. miſts themſelues, as contempt of authoritie, the crueltie of Cain, the couetouſnes of Balam, which aptly agree to the Papiſts: for the Pope will be ſubiect to none, no not to a generall Councell: witneſſe Martine the 5. and Eugenius the 4. who would not ſtand to the decrees of the Councels of Conſtance, and Baſill. As touching murthers the ſtreetes haue ouerflowen with the blood of Gods Saints: For couetouſneſſe let Eraſmus ſpeake *Chiliad.1.Cent.9.12. Non datur Baptiſmus, non licet fieri Chriſtianum niſi numeres, non comprobant Matrimonium niſi numeres, nõ audiunt pœnitentium confeſſiones, niſi ſperent præmium: ſacrificant cõducti, non pſallunt gratis, non orant gratis: non impertiunt corpus Chriſti, niſi numeres: quin vendunt ſepulturam, idque in alieno ſolo.* In Engliſh it is thus much. *It is not lawfull for thee to be*

bapti-

baptized except thou pay: Matrimonie without money is not ratified: the Confessours heare no Confessions without reward: they sacrifice for hire: they neither sing, nor pray, nor giue names freely: No they will not minister the Sacrament without wages: they sell sepulchres in another mans soyle. O the exceeding dropsie of couetousnes: may I not cry out with Plautus. *Tenaces dominos nostra ætas tulit, quos Harpagonas, Harpyas, Tantalos appellare soleo, in medio Oceani gurgite sitibundos: Non Midæ, non Cræsi, non omnis Persarum copia tantæ eorum ingluviem explere potest. This age hath gripple Lords (which I am accustomed to cal Harpagons, Harpyes, Tantalusses thirstie in the midst of the Ocean sea: their hellish gorge is not satisfied with the money of Midas, with the coyne of Crœsus, nor with the pomp of the Persians.* But they will here obiect that they haue not beene condemned by any generall Councell, and therfore are not for these properties (though all laid togither) to be accoũted heretikes: which obiection how friuolous it is, I hope to make manifest. Were the

O inexplebilem auaritiã.

Aululat.

These were Monsters.

Ob.

Sol.

the heretikes in thappoſtles time condemned by a general Councell? they might haue defended thẽſelues by this obiectiõ aſwel as the Papiſtes. Ebion and Cerinthus againſt whome Saint Iohn wrote his gõſpell, who dare denie them to be heretikes? Tertullian in his booke *de præſcriptione*, and Irenæus *aduerſus hereſes* mention multitudes of hereſies not then condemned by any generall Councell. I dare not alleadge the authoritie of Iewes who call the Chriſtians *minim vndcophrim bagnikkar*: that is, *Heretikes and denying the foundation*, though not condemned by a generall Councell, leaſt they accuſe me of Iudaiſme as they doe the Proteſtants, becauſe wee doe denie Images.

Laſtly how can it bee of the eſſence of hereſie to be condemned by a generall Councell, ſeing as Auguſtine confeſſeth that former plenarie Councels may be amended by latter, which muſt needs bee vnderſtood of errour: for the condition which Saint Auguſtine repeateth in the firſt endureth to the laſt. *Si quid forte à veritate deuiatum eſt.* If

in

in ought they swerue from the truth, and except that be vnderstood he answereth not the thing that was obiected by the Donatistes: they opposed the Councell of Cyprian in a matter of doctrine not of discipline, S. Augustine replieth Bishops might be deceiued and so might Councels, in what then but in matters of doctrine? And so I proceed to the fourth Reason taken from particular heresies: with this admonition that this was the verie obiection of the Pelagians as may be seene in Augustine *tomo 7. lib. 4. contra duas epis. Pelag in fine libri*: to whome hee answereth, *Quasi nulla hæresis damnata sit*, *&c.* as if no heresie were condemned without a Councell.

The fourth reason of particular hereſies.

IN the recitall of particular hereſies, conſidering that I aime at no lõg diſcourſe in this my treatiſe, I will beginne briefly with *Pelagianiſme* making this ſillogiſme: they which hold the ſame opinion with *Pelagius* and vſe the ſame argumẽts that *Pelagius* did, are Pelagians, but the Papiſts hold with *Pelagius* and vſe his arguments: *ergo*, they are Pelagians. The aſſumption I prooue out of Hieroms workes againſt the Pelagians, who hold (as he teſtifieth *ad Cteſiphontem*,) that *Mandata dei are poſsibilia*, *Gods commandements are poſsible to be kept*: and prooue the ſame by our ſauiour his ſaying: *Iugum meum ſuaue eſt: my yoke is eaſie, & mandata eius non ſunt grauia, and his commaundements are not grieuous*: to which the learned father anſwereth, *Levia ſunt ad comparationem Iudaicæ ſuper-*

Hieron. lib. 2

ſuperſtitionis, they are light in reſpect of the Iewes ſuperſtion. Secondly they thus diſpute, *Si in operibus meis deus mihi adiutor extiterit, non mihi debetur merces ſed ei qui in me operatus eſt: if my good things come frō god, then there is no reward for me &c.* To which he anſwereth thus: *Contra Deum arma linguam tuam: arme thy tongue againſt God, and ſo forth:* are not theſe the very arguments of Papiſts? Reade the Rhemiſtes vpon the places remembred, alſo vpon the ſecond of the Corinth. 5. cap. 10. where thou ſhalt finde this blaſphemy, *that heauen is as well the reward of good workes, as hell is the ſtipend of euill workes:* which is the drift of the argument of the Pelagians. I will adioyne ſome other ſayings of the ſame Father, by which euery one may further ſee the truth of this my charge. *Facilia dicis dei mandata & tamen nullum proferre potes qui vniuerſa compleverit:* thou affirmeſt the commandements are eaſie, and yet thou canſt not bring forth any that hath kept them. Againe, *Tunc iuſti ſumus quando nos peccatores fatemur: & iuſtitia noſtra non ex pr*

The fourth reason of particular heresies.

IN the recitall of particular heresies, considering that I aime at no lõg discourse in this my treatise, I will beginne briefly with *Pelagianisme* making this sillogisme: they which hold the same opinion with *Pelagius* and vse the same argumẽts that *Pelagius* did, are Pelagians, but the Papists hold with *Pelagius* and vse his arguments: *Ergo*, they are Pelagians. The assumption I prooue out of Hieroms workes against the Pelagians, who hold (as he testifieth *ad Ctesiphontem*,) that *Mandata dei are possibilia*, *Gods commandements are possible to be kept*: and prooue the same by our sauiour his saying: *Iugum meum suaue est: my yoke is easie, & mandata eius non sunt grauia, and his commaundements are not grieuous*: to which the learned father answereth, *Levia sunt ad comparationem Iudaicæ super-*

Hierom. lib. 2

ſuperſtitionis, they are light in reſpect of the Iewes ſuperſtion. Secondly they thus diſpute; *Si in operibus meis deus mihi adiutor extiterit, non mihi debetur merces ſed ei qui in me operatus eſt: if my good things come frō god, then there is no reward for me &c.* To which he anſwereth thus: *Contra Deum arma linguam tuam: arme thy tongue against God, and ſo forth:* are not theſe the very arguments of Papiſts? Reade the Rhemiſtes vpon the places remembred, alſo vpon the ſecond of the Corinth. 5. cap. 10. where thou ſhalt finde this blaſphemy, *that heauen is as well the reward of good workes, as hell is the ſtipend of evill workes*: which is the drift of the argument of the Pelagians. I will adioyne ſome other ſayings of the ſame Father, by which euery one may further ſee the truth of this my charge. *Facilia dicis dei mandata & tamen nullum proferre potes qui vniuerſa compleverit*: thou affirmeſt the commandements are eaſie, and yet thou canſt not bring forth any that hath kept them. Againe, *Tunc iuſti ſumus quando nos peccatores fatemur: & iuſtitia noſtra non ex proprio*

constat merito sedex dei misericordia, dicente scriptura Iustus est accusator sui, in principio sermonis. Then are we righteous when we confesse our selues sinners, and our righteousnesse consisteth not of our merits, but of gods mercie, seing the scripture saith: The righteous is the accuser of himselfe. To let passe the rest of his most excellent sayings I come to the heresie of Montanists.

The 2. heresie of Montanisme.

The Church in Tertullians time taught, that fasting was restrained neither to certaine daies, nor to certaine meates: which opinion Tertullian beeing a Montanist confuteth in his booke *aduersus Psychicos*. That the Church so taught I prooue out of his second chapter, where he setteth downe the arguments vsed against Montanus and confuteth them: The Church is brought in speaking thus: *Indifferenter ieiunandum ex arbitrio pro temporibus & causis vnius cuiusque, sic & Apostolos dicunt obseruasse nullum aliud imponentes iugum certorum & in commune omnibus obeundorum ieiuniorum.* We must fast as the cause of euery one requi-

requireth, and the Apoſtles did thus obſerue it, laying no yoke of certaine and determined faſts vpon men. You ſee how the Church plainely ſpeaketh againſt the reſtraining of faſting to certaine daies, and as plaine is her ſpeech immediatly after againſt the reſtraining it to certaine meates. *Xerophagius verò nouum affectati officii nomen & proximum Ethnicæ ſuperſtitioni. The eating of certain drie meates is a newe name of ſtraunge and affected office neere to the ſuperſtition of the Heathen.* Againe, *Apoſtolus eſt deteſtator eorum, qui ſicut nubere prohibent, ita iubent cibis abſtinere à deo conditis. The Apoſtle himſelfe deteſteth them that forbid to marry, and commaund to abſtaine from meates created of God.* The verdict the Church gaue concerning faſting which in that book Tertullian as a Montaniſt would confute: out of which teſtimonies I thus conclude. They which reſtraine faſting to certaine meates and times, holde not as the auncient Church helde, but with Montanus: the Papiſtes reſtraine faſting to certen meates & to certen times: *Ergo*, the Papiſts hold no: with the

auncient church, but with the Montanists a-gainst the same, and as they doe hold with them concerning fasting so doe they likewise in the marriage of Ministers, as may be prooued out of his booke *Monogany*, & 12. chap. which he wrote beeing a Montanist: the Ministers were as he speaketh *digami*, *twise married: omnia licent episcopis*, all things are lawfull for bishops, which he cō-futeth by the text of the 1. of Timothy: and 3. chap. *A bishop must be the husband of one wife*, so that I may say in these two points *Non ovum ovo similius, quam Papistæ Montanistis: the Papists and Montanists are both alike*. And so I passe to the third hæresie of Cainisme.

The 3 hæresie of Cainisme.

The hæresie which teacheth that he which before baptisme had a wife and shee dying, the partie marrying another, ought not to be consecrated bishoppe, is by S. Hierom in his Epistle to Oceanus called *Cania Hæreses*, The hæresie of Caine: In which epistle he answereth the place of the 1. of Tim 3. cap. *That a Bishop must be the husband of*

one

one vvife, ſaying, *præcipit ne ſacerdotes bina aut trina coniugia ſortiantur more Iudeorum aut Patriarcharum*, He commaundeth that prieſts haue not two or 3 wiues, after the manner of the Iewes and Patriarches. Now who is ſo ignorant that knoweth not the Papiſts to hold this hæreſie of Caine, and to abuſe the place of Timothy to that purpoſe: *hanc hæreſim ſequitur Romana eccleſia*, ſaith Eraſmus, this hæreſie is embraſed of the Romiſh Church.

The 4. hereſie of Manichei ſme

Although I might be very long in this hæreſie, ſhewing where in the Papiſts agree with the *M*anichees: yet I will reduce their agreement to three heads: firſt the Manichees hold the ſcriptures to be corrupt, *Auguſtine lib.* 1. *de Morib. cap.* 29. which opinion he confuteth in theſe wordes: *ſi Pauli epiſtolam ad Romanos ſcriptam corruptam eſſe contendis aliam proferas incorruptam, vel alium codicem potius in quo eiuſdem epiſtolæ eadem ſyncera & incorrupta eſt*, if for example thou contendeſt, that S. Paules epiſtle to the Romans is corrupt; thou muſt ſhewe a-

another incorrupt, or rather another book of the same Apostle wherein the same epistle is syncere & vncorrupt. *Canus Lindanus & Reinolds* for my owne part I thinke the nothing inferiour to these Hæreticks in this point, nay haue not the Papists corrupted this same Epistle? leauing out the 11. cap. 6. v. all this sentence, *but if it be of workes it is no more of grace, or els workes were no more workes.* For it cleane ouerthroweth their grand Hæresie: here for the same accusation of diuine scripture I charge them with *Helvidianisme*, for *Helvius* held the same, as Hierome witnesseth in his booke against him: *tibi stultissime persuasisti græcos codices esse falsatos*: O foole in the highest degree thou hast perswaded thy selfe that the greeke coppies are falsified. And againe, *Tu mira impudētia hæc in græcis codicibus falsata esse aicis.* thou with wonderfull impudencie sayest these things are falsified in the greeke bookes. Thus the Papists ioyne with Helvidius, and therefore by Hierome his verdict as they are full fooles, so haue they brasen faces. Secondly they permitted their

heires

hearers to marrie, but not their elect as they called them: *August. lib. 2. de Mor. Mani. cap. 19. Auditores vestri quorum apud vos secundus est gradus ducere atque habere uxores non prohibentur: your hearers which are in the 2 degree are not forbidden to marrie:* out of which place I gather that they did not condemne marriages simply, as the Papistes would make them, & if they did can any one speake more contemptuously of mariage then the Papistes doe.

M. Martin in his discouery, calleth it a prophaning of sacred orders. Innocentius & Syricius disproue it by these 2. places: *be yee holy because I am holy:* and againe: *they that are in the flesh cannot please God:* and these arguments are still maintained by the learneddest Papistes, by which they conclude that mariage is an enemie to holines, and a friend to filthines: the Lord rebuke them for these their blasphemies, *cap. 15. sect. 11.*

Thirdly in fasting they are right Manichees, for as Augustine saith *lib. 2. cap. 13.* they did *nihil carnium gustare*, and yet did eate *exquisitas & peregrinas fruges multis fercu-*

lis

lis varietas, they did eate no flesh, & yet did eate many and strange fruites varied in many dishes: yea (as Augustine saieth) if one of their elect should but annoint his lippes with bacon, or but take the sauour of it, as a breaker of his fast, or abstinence, he shall be condemned to hell fire; is not this the right popish fast? therefore I say to the Papistes as he did to these heretikes: *quæso aduertite errores*: I desire you consider your errors.

The 5. heresie of Colliridianisme.

Lib. 3. & hæres. 79.

The Collyridians as Epiphanius writeth worshipped the virgin Mary: against whom he writeth thus: τὴν Μαρίαμ μηδεὶς προσκυνείτω, let no man worship Marie, the word vsed signifieth to cast himselfe downe, and so to worship with religious Honour. To proue that the Papists worship Marie not with δουλεία, that is, *seruice*, which they graunt, but with λατρεία, that is, *religious seruice*, which they denie, I vse their owne testimony vpon the 2. of Luke, and 39. verse, where Anna is saide to worshipp the Lord by fasting and prayers: their note is this, that fasting is an act of Religion, wherby we doe worship God

as

as we do by praier, then by their owne doctrine they worſhip Marie with λατρείαν, *religious worſhip*; for they faſt and pray to her. Their owne words are theſe in their Pſalter, made for the praiſe of Marie according to the Romanes manner. *In omni tribulatione & angustia ſuccurrat nobis Maria*: in all affliction let Marie help vs: And againe, *Solue vincula reis, perfer lumen cæcis, mala nostra pelle, bona cuncta poſce, monſtra te eſſe matrem*: that is, Looſe the bondes of priſoners, giue light to the blinde, driue away all our euills, obtaine al good things for vs, ſhew thy ſelfe to be a mother. Laſtly, *Per virginem Mariam conſedat nobis Dominus ſalutem*: that is the Lord ſaue vs for the virgine Marie her ſake: what greater things can they deſire at Gods hands? Nay, what chriſtian heart can abide theſe blaſphemies? if this be not to honour Marie, what is to honour her? I ende this hereſie with Epiphanius his queſtion, *Quæ Scriptura aliquid de hac re narrauit?* what Scripture ſpeaketh thus?

The 6. hereſie of Angeliſme.

In

Iræneus lib.1 In regard of breuitie I will knitt vp many
hereſies together: the Carpocratians wor-
ſhipped the Images of Ieſus; the Valentini-
ans the croſſe: the Heracleonites prayed for
the dead. Elxay the horrible heretike taught
Epiphan.14. Hæreſ. praier in an vnknowen tongue. *Nemo quæ-
rat interpretationem, ſed ſolum in oratione
hæc dicat: Let no man ſeeke for interpreta-
tion, but onely let him pray thus.* I will there-
fore in this ſixth particular hereſie brieflie
Hæreſ.39. ſpeak of Angeliſme: *Angelici* (ſaieth Augu-
ſtine) *in angelorum cultu ſunt inclinati: the
Angeliſts were inclined to the worſhipping
of Angels.* Iræneus likewiſe ſheweth the
Lib.2.cap.59. practiſe of the church againſt this worſhip.
*Eccleſia non facit aliquid inuocationibus an-
gelicis ſed mundè & purè dirigit orationes
ad Dominum qui omnia fecit: The Church
doth not any thing by prayer to Angels, but
purely directeth her praier to the Lord that
Lib.de vera dei ſimul. cap.17. made all things.* Againe Lactantius writeth
thus. *Non eſt in Angelis quicquam niſi pa-
rendi neceſsitas, itaque nullum ſibi honorem
tribui volunt, quorum honor in deo eſt. There*

is

is nothing in the Angels but neceſſitie to obey, therefore they will haue no honour to be giuen to them vvhoſe honour is in God. And in his firſt booke and ſeuenth chapter? *Miniſtri Dei coli non volunt, quippe qui nihil præter iuſſum, & Dei voluntatem faciunt.* Gods attendants will not be adored, for they doe nothing but his commaundement and will. If theſe men were aliue, what would they haue written againſt the *Papiſtes* who maintaine the adoration and worſhipping of Angels?

The

The fifth reason of the popish dissolute and discomfortable doctrine.

IT is not vnknowne how the Papists without all shame accuse our doctrine of looseness, whereas all our writings, sermons, and exercises tende to holines of life: for we preach mortification of the flesh, continuance in prayer, and in a word all holy duties: we permit no filthie stewes, neither by rash vowes cause incontinencie and fornication, which are notorious and knowne things amongst the Papists: *Vrbs est* (saith Mantuan) *iam tota a lupanar, the whole citie is a stewes*, speaking of Rome. And as the liues of the Papists haue beene odious to God, and to man, so I doubt not but in this motiue to prooue that their doctrine tendeth to horrible dissolutenes, and hellish horrour. In Aquinas his supplement *art.* 2. *quæst.* 2. it is taught that no man ought

ought to be contrite in heart for originall ſinne, which is a licentious and carnall doctrine: did not the prophet Dauid in the 51. pſalme, confeſſe *that in ſinne his mother conceiued him*: and S. Paul crieth out, *O miſerable man that I am, who ſhall redeeme me frõ this bodie of ſinne?* out of which places we may gather the griefe that thoſe holy men of God conceiued for their naturall corruption. The Papiſts reaſon why we muſt not be contrite for originall ſinne, is worthie of conſideration. *Non eſt voluntarium: it is not voluntarie*, ſay they. The ſyllogiſme is thus to be made: We are not to be contrite but for voluntarie ſinnes: but originall ſinne is not voluntarie: *ergo* we are not to be contrite for it. I anſwer to the propoſition, they might as well conclude that it is no ſinne: let Auguſtine diſſolue this knotte, who in his 1. booke of Retract. and 13. chap. writeth thus: *Nullo modo peccatum eſt niſi ſit voluntarium, peccatum quippe illud intelligendum eſt quod tantummodo peccatum eſt, non pœna peccati, quamvis & illa, quæ immeritò non voluntaria peccata dicuntur, quia vel à neſcientibus* Rom. 7.

cientibus vel à coactis perpetrantur non omninò possunt sine voluntate committi, quoniam & ille qui peccat ignorans, voluntarie quoque peccat, &c. It is no sinne except it be voluntarie, this speach is to be vnderstood of sinne which is simply sinne, and not a punishment of sinne, although those sinnes which are vnfitly called sinnes against our wills (because they are either committed by constraint, or by ignorance) cannot be altogether without the consent of will, for he which sinneth of ignorance, sinneth willingly. Thus hath Augustine answeared the popish reason to the full.

Secondly the Papists teach, that some sinnes are veniall of their owne nature, that is deserue not eternall death, which must needes cause men to cast off the bridle and reynes of holy life: why doeth Basil in his shorter Definitions and 10. rule, prooue that euery sinne is deadly by this place, *The vvages of sinne is death.* But to withdraw men from the opinion of the lightnes of sinne, well saith Hierome *ad Cælantiam: Tanto facilius abstinemus à quocunq; delicto, quan-*

tò

tò illud magis metuimus, nec etiam titò ad maiora progreditur, qui etiam parua formidat. We abstaine so much the more easily frõ sinne, by how much we feare the same: neither doth he make hast to greater sinnes, which feareth the lesser.

Thirdly the Papists teach, that the sacrament giues grace *ex opere operato*, of worke wrought without faith: for howsoeuer Bellarmine requireth it as a disposition, yet the Censure of Colõ, which knew the Romish doctrine as well as Bellarmine reasoneth thus: *pueris extra omnem dubitationis aleam sacramenta prodesse nemo sanæ mentis dubitare potest, in quibus tamen nulla est fides, nulla cordis motio, nullus peccatorum dolor, aut gemitus, & sanè si in pueris ea sit Sacramentorum natura, cur non erit similis omnino in alijs maximè? cùm neque Christus, nec Ecclesia vnquam vel vllam diversitatis fecit mentionem. Without all controuersie children receiue benefit by the Sacraments, in whome there is no faith, no motion of the heart, no sorrow for sinne, and why doe not others likewise so? seeing neither Christ*

nor the Church mentioneth any reason to the contrarie. What is this, but to cause men to come without repentance to the sacraments? for if thou be not a murderer, a theefe, or an adulterer, &c. the sacraments will repleniſh thee with grace: but (Christian Reader) take heede of this dissolute and looſe doctrine, for he destroieth himselfe, and damneth his soule, that commeth to the Sacraments without faith and repentance, and he is so farre from receiuing grace, that he purchaseth Gods eternall wrath and irefull displeasure to himselfe.

Fourthly the *Papists* bind their votaries, prelats and priests to keepe their vowes, which yet burne in filthie lusts, yea are not those vowes vngodly which cãnot be kept
1. Tim. 5. 11. without incõtinency? If widows (as S. *Paule* saith) waxe wanton against Christ beeing warme, idle, and well fedde, and so lust after husbands, what doe many papists more warme, more idle, and better fed then those poore widows were, that S. *Paule* speaketh of? What doe they I say lust after? but with them this diuinitie is currant, *si non castè, cautè*

cautè tamen: if not chastly, yet warily.

Fiftly the papists teach that the pope may giue pardon *de pœnitentijs iniungendis*, that is, *of penance to be performed*, *Ergo* a man may haue a pardon before he sinne, which is to open a gappe to all sinne, yea the rich man may boldly transgresse, because he is able to giue largely for pardons. Folk against Allen.

Sixtly, they teach that the loue of a mans enemie is counselled by our sauiour Christ, not commaunded, so that a man is not bound to loue his enemie by Gods commandemẽt, O carnal & licẽtious libertines, what is more easie for man then to loue his friende? what is more against the proud spirit of a man thẽ to loue his enemie? And so from dissoluteness of doctrine I come to the discomfort of the same. Ferus vpon Matth. comfureth it. *Aquin. 22. 25. q. 9. ar.*

No man ought to be assured of his saluation by faith, but by hope (saith the papist) resting vpon his owne merits, which is to racke and torment a christian soule, for euery on must say with Hierom in his dialogue against the Luciferans, *Credo Domine & tamen secundum fidem meũ fieri nolo, sic enim* *Cens. colon.*

peribo: I beleeue Lord, yet let it not be according to my beleeue, for then I perish: and with Augustine, *tota spes mea non nisi in valde magna misericordia tua*: my whole hope is only in thy great mercy: but more of this in another motiue, and therefore I oppose their own Catechisme against them which excellently confuteth this desperate doctrine: *profecto neque in dignitatem fidei, neque operum meorum, vt me certum faciã rectè respexero*. Verely for certainty that god is mercifull to me I must neither looke to the dignitie of my faith or of my works, *sed in passionem tuam ô Christe oculos mentis defigam*, but O Christ I will fasten the eyes of my minde vpon thy passion, *cum defecerit virtus mea non diffidam, quia si sanguis tuus interpellet pro me salvus ero*, when my goodnes is eclipsed I will not distrust, for if thy bloode entreat for me I shall be saued.

10. lib. con. & 29.

Cat. col.

Secondly they teach that by contrition & sorrow for sinne, the guilt of sinne is wholly taken away, but because a man can not be assured of the sufficiencie of his sorow, therfore

Stapl. Aque. 7. ar. 2.

therefore he muſt both confeſſe and ſatisfie Gods iuſtice for his ſinnes: O helliſh deuice of man! If no man can be aſſured of the ſufficiencie of his contrition and ſorrow, how can he certifie his ſoule that his Confeſsion and Satisfaction are ſufficient? if he can not be aſſured of one, he can not likewiſe be aſſured of the other, and ſo muſt needes be ſwallowed vp in the gulfe of deſpaire. Hold this therefore (Chriſtian ſoule) that thy reconciliation dependeth not vpon ſufficient confeſsion, contrition, and ſatisfaction, but vpon the merit of Chriſt: and ſay as the gloſſe doth vpon *Gratian*, that theſe doe not cauſe and deſerue forgiuenes of ſinnes, but onely Gods mercie is the cauſe thereof: and that true ſorrow is a ſigne to thee of the forgiuenes of thy ſinnes. And as the doctrine of Satisfaction is deſperate, ſo it is a moſt looſe and diſſolute doctrine: for, *pag. 376.*

Si dederis marcas, & eis impleueris arcas,
Culpâ ſolueris quacunq; ligatus eris: that is, *If thou fillest the Popes coffers with mony, thou ſhalt be looſed from all thy faults.* Alas, alas, what will not a man giue for the re-

demption of his soule? thousands of riuers oyle; yea he had rather cause his sonnes to passe through fire then to perfourme true repentance.

Iob 2.
Mich. 6.

The sixt reason of Idolatrie.

IN Philosophie there was almost no opinion so voide of reason, but it found some patron, and as it was in philosophie, so now it is in Diuinity; for else how could the Papists defende the worship of images? Of these popish idolaters I say with Lactantius, *Venia concedi potest imperitis & ijs qui se sapientes non fatentur, his vero non potest qui sapientiam professi stultitiam potius exhibent. The ignorant may be pardoned, but to those that professing wisdome manifest their follie, pardon cannot be granted.* But let vs see how they excuse their idolatrie.

Lib. de orig. erroris. cap. 3

First

First Bellarmine maketh a difference betweene an idol and an image: an idol is an image of that which is not, but an image is a figure of that which is: to take his graunt I will first conclude out of his owne wordes that the *Papists* are idolaters, and then by inuincible arguments disprooue this distinction. They which worship images of those things that are not extant, are idolaters: but the *Papists* worshippe the images of those things that are not extant: *ergo* they are idolaters. The assumption I thus prooue: Christopher, George, and Katherine were neuer extant, but they worship their images: *ergo* they worship images of thinges that neuer were. For the disproofe of his distinction I will vse his owne arguments, and confession against himselfe. *First* (saith he) *the Scripture neuer calleth any true image an idoll*, this I disprooue out of his 13. chap. where he confesseth that the Iewes worshipped God in an image or idol. That in which the Iewes worshipped God, is an idol: but the Iewes worshipped God in an image: *ergo* an idol is an image. Secondly (saith he)

Lib. 2. cap. 3. de Imag.

Heerbranio. com.

the scripture calleth Idolls *elilim*, that is *Nothing*, and vseth other names to the same purpose. If this reason be good, then because the scripture calleth Idols *pesilim*, & by other like names, it must of necessitie follow that they represent something: if any demaund, why the scripture calleth Idols nothing, and vanitie, and lies, I answere because of their effects, so saith Kimhi: *dabar she eno mogil* that which profiteth not, is called *elil*, for in truth they neither helpe the worshippers of them, nor can they helpe them, and so are meere vanity: and by this reason is answered his argument taken out of the Corinthians 8 chap. where an Idol is called nothing, nothing it is in regard of profitte and commodity, yet may it represent somthing: His fourth reason is, because the Fathers called Heresies Idols: as an hæresie is a false imagination, so [saith he] is an Idoll a false Image: thus indeede the fathers speake, out of which I thus dispute. An heresie is an false opinion, and imagination of some thing whereof there is a trueth, as for example, the *Anthropomorphits* that thought god was in

Hierem. Hosea 4.

Epiph. Hær. 50.

shape

shape & proportion like a man, did they not conceaue a false imagination of a reall thing whereof there is a trueth, *Ergo*, by the Iesuites owne argument an *Idol* may represent a thing, that hath a beeing and subsistance: but there is a plaine and euident demonstration why the Fathers call hæresies Idols, because to serue God as we list, and not as he will is Idolatrie: he neither taketh nor requireth any thing at our hands, besides his worship and that according to his will, *who requireth this at your handes*, (saith the Prophet Esay:) vnlesse therfore they can proone that God will be serued with materiall and artificiall Images, and is content to accept that honour as done to himselfe, that is yeelded vnto them, their adoring them maketh them idols, and themselues Idolaters. His last reason taken out of Tertullian cleane ouerthroweth his cause, εἶδος (saith Tertullian) *græcè formam sonat, ab eo per diminutionem εἴδωλον æquè apud nos formulam fecit, igitur omnis forma vel formula idolum se dici exposcit*. This word εἶδος in greeke signifieth a shape, whence εἴδωλον is deriued as a diminutiue

the scripture calleth Idolls *elilim*, that is *Nothing*, and vseth other names to the same purpose. If this reason be good, then because the scripture calleth Idols *pesilim*, & by other like names, it must of necessitie follow that they represent something: if any demaund, why the scripture calleth Idols nothing, and vanitie, and lies, I answere because of their effects, so saith Kimhi: *dabar she eno mogil* that which profiteth not, is called *elil*, for in truth they neither helpe the worshippers of them, nor can they helpe them, and so are meere vanity: and by this reason is answered his argument taken out of the Corinthians 8 chap. where an Idol is called nothing, nothing it is in regard of profite and commodity, yet may it represent somthing: His fourth reason is, because the Fathers called Heresies Idols: as an heresie is a false imagination; so [saith he] is an Idoll a false Image: this indeede the fathers speake, out of which I thus dispute. An heresie is an false opinion, and imagination of some thing whereof there is a trueth, as for example, the *Anthropomorphits* that thought god was in

Hierem. Hosea 4.

Epiph. Her. 50.

shape

shape & proportion like a man, did they not conceaue a false imagination of a reall thing whereof there is a trueth, *Ergo*, by the Iesuites owne argument an Idol may represent a thing, that hath a beeing and subsistance: but there is a plaine and euident demonstration why the Fathers call hæreſies Idols, becauſe to ſerue God as we liſt, and not as he will is Idolatrie: he neither taketh nor requireth any thing at our hands, beſides his worſhip and that according to his will, *who requireth this at your handes*, (ſaith the Prophet Eſay:) vnleſſe therfore they can proue that God will be ſerued with materiall and artificiall Images, and is content to accept that honour as done to himſelfe, that is yeelded vnto them, their adoring them maketh them idols, and themſelues Idolaters. His laſt reaſon taken out of Tertullian cleane ouerthroweth his cauſe, Εἶδος (ſaith Tertullian) *græcè formam ſonat, ab eo per diminutionem* εἴδωλον *æquè apud nos formulam fecit, igitur omnis forma vel formula idolum ſe dici expoſcit.* This word Εἶδος in greeke ſignifieth a ſhape, whence εἴδωλον is deriued as a diminutiue

nutiue, and with vs signifieth any shape, & therefore euery shape or likenesse may be called an idol. If euery shape may be called an idol, then a shape of a thing that is extãt may be so called: but by Tertullians opinion euery shape may be so called, *ergo* a shape of a thing that is extant and hath a subsistance: now whereas the Iesuite in fine and in conclusion out of Eustathius saith that an Idol *is inane spectrum, & phantasma*, a vaine facie such as we frame in our imaginations, & as the shaddowes & ghostes of the dead are, doth it not as well prooue that for the matter it is nothing, as it doth that it representeth nothin? yes verely, for in erueth those things are as he speaketh *umbræ*, shadows, & *cavæ imagines*, images without any solidity, so that he might by this argue an Idol to haue no matter, & no bodily subsistãce, as he doth that it is nothing formally, that is representeth nothing. Hauing retorted his arguments against himselfe, I wil now briefly shew that an Idol representeth something. The 2. Commandement shall helpe vs with the first argument, in which, as the Papists confesse

confesse an Idol is forbidden, but that which is there forbidden, is a similitude of something, as of things in heauen and in earth, or vnder the earth, so saith Moses, *thou shalt not make the forme of a man, or of a woman, or of any creature in the earth.* Deut. 4. 15. 16.

Secondly I disproue their distinctiō out of the 14. of wisdome, verse, 12. where ἀρχὴ πορνείας, the beginning of whordome is ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων, the inventiō of Idols, what doth he call an Idol? read the 15 verse and thou shalt find that the father sorrowing for his sonne, εἰκόνα ποιήσας, worketh his Image, and so worshippeth the dead as God: by which euery man may see that an Idol & an Image are there put to signifie both one thing, except he will hold that the Image which the father maketh of his sonne representeth nothing: which no *Papist* though exceeding bolde and blinde dare affirme.

Thirdly I demaund whether the Images which Carpocrats worshipped were not Idols? if only idols be forbidden in the 2. com. thē the Images there forbiddē must be idols, yet were they Images of Iesus. I let passe the images of *Paule*, Pythagoras and others *Fran. lib. 2. cap. 23.* *Epiph. 24.*

which euery one know to represent something. The Melchizedechians also worshipped the Image of Moses, yet can no man deny that to be an Idoll, out of all which it is easie to conclude, that an Idoll is not alwaies an image of that which is not.

Epiph. 55.

Fourthly, *Baal* himselfe, which the Scripture detesteth as a most infamous Idoll was nothing else but a corporall Image erected vnto God, by which the people dreamed they serued and pleased God, as may be gathered by Hosea in his 2. chapter: *At that day saith the Lord, thou shalt call me no more Baal:* And in Elias time, 1. King. 18, the Israelites haulted betweene two opinions, partly serving God, partly their Idolls; likewise the Gentiles which the king of Assyria placed in Samaria (2. King. 17. 33) feared God & worshipped their Idolls. Lastly the Iewes sware by God & their King, that is, by their Idolls, for they called their Idolls Kings, some expound it as if it were a proper name, they sware by God and by Malchon, but that can not be, becatise of the affixe and pronoune that is ioyned with it, for proper names are

Sophon. 1.

not

not compoũded with affixes & pronounes, as Elias proueth; by all which testimonies it is euident and plaine, that all the Iewes were not so seduced as to thinke their Idolls to be God, for then they would not haue bin like a cake halfe baked, (as the Prophet Hosea speaketh) now seruing God and then their Idolls. *Cap 7.4. ver.*

Fiftly, the Heathen did not thinke their Idolls to be God, which I prooue out of Lactantius: *Non ipsa inquiunt timemus sed deos ad quorum imaginem ficta, & quorum nominibus consecrata sunt: Wee doe not reuerence and vvorship the Idolls themselues, but those which are represented by them, and those to vvhome they are consecrated:* what is more direct then this against Bellarmine, who would haue men beleeue that the Heathen did account their Idolls to be God, and therfore reuileth M. Caluin a man of famous memorie not being able with any probabilitie to take away his arguments. And if that opinion of Macrobius be true, that all the heathẽ Gods are to be referred to the sunne, as Apollo, Capis, Serapis and others, how cã *Lib. 2. de vero dei sim.* *1. Satur. c. 17.*

it

it enter into the heart of any learned man to imagine, that the Gentiles were so ignorant as to think their idols to be God, except they could not distinguish betweene them and the Sunne: their idols then representing the Sunne, of necessitie it followeth, that they represented something; except the Sunne be nothing. Thus the Papists defending Idolatrie, goe about to take the Sunne out of the world, making it nothing, and so prooue themselues vnworthie the light therof. And so hauing disprooued his distinction, I will proceede to other of his assertions, and then set downe Lactantius his reasons against Images, which are as directly opposite to the Papists, as if he had of purpose written against them. Bellarmine confesseth that in his 8. chap. that *Idiotæ qui vident picturas, & non possunt legere scripturas, possunt ac debent à prælatis & Concionatoribus instituí, alioquin fateor non sine periculo exhiberi imperitis eiusmodi picturas. The lay people vvhich see and beholde Images and can not reade Scriptures, ought to be instructed of their prelates and preachers, else I confesse*

that

that Images to the ignorant are not vvithout daunger deliuered. This is as much as to giue a madde man a ſworde, and then to watch ouer him leaſt he hurt himſelfe: but haue the *Papiſts* preachers to teach the people? yea, their prieſts for ignorance are very Idols, many yeares agoe was this complaint vttered that in times paſt there were golden prieſtes and treene cuppes, but now golden cuppes and treene prieſts, but of this ſee more in a former motiue: and whereas he ſaith that lay people may reade the Scriptures, doth he not bidde defiance to other *Papiſts*, who by might and maine maintaine that the Scriptures are not to be reade of the ignorant. But nowe let vs ſee what the people are to be taught, they are to be taught, that Images are to be worſhipped by themſelues not accidentally or improperly, ſo that worſhippe is due to images themſelues, and not onely as they repreſent ſome other thing: are the people able to reach this diuinitie? nay the very Papiſts themſelues cannot poſsibly conceiue theſe diſtin-

Bez.

Cenſ. Col.

Bellar. 2o.

distinctions, yea they are flatly opposite to other learned papists: and lastly the Heathen neuer taught so grossly of the worshipping of their Images. To goe a little further, the people must not be taught that Images are to be worshipped with the highest kind of worshippe which is due to god, as touching their manner of speech and wordes, but, *si de re ipsa agatur imagines impropriè coluntur eo genere cultus quo examplar ipsum, if it be concerning the matter and thing it selfe an Image accidentally must be honoured with the same honour wherewith the thing representeais worshipped and honoured.* Is not this to speake mysteries to the people, yea to speake lies in hypocrisie? Alphonsus de Castro a learned Papist accounteth Serenus Bishop of Massilia; and Epiphanius enemies to Images, because they brake them in peeces, and yet wee may not doe so without hæresie (for saith Bellarmine) when Serenus brake them, the people beeing neere conuerted to the faith worshipped thē for gods: it were hard for Bellarmine to proove the trueth of this sentence, namely a true Christian

cap. 22. & 23

Bell. cap. 6.

stian to worship an image for God, but if Serenus did well for breaking them, because the people worshipped them as Gods, why may not we break them without any hurt, for it is well knowne that the ignorant papists amongst vs haue taken them for gods? Thus hauing gathered out of Bellarmine his garden some sweete flowers and nosegaies, nay rather poysonful hearbs, I come now to Lactãtius his reasons against images, which whether they conclude not against the Papists as well as against the Heathen, let any indifferent man iudge. *Postquam Deus præsto esse cæpit* (saith Lactantius) *iam simulachroeius non est opus, supervacua enim est hominis imago, cùm homo præsto est. When God is present there is no neede of his image, for the image of man is superfluous when man himselfe is present.* Yet Bellarmine will needes defende the image of God, although he be present euery where, because he is not seene, and so cutteth the sinewes of Lactantius his reason: and here I would haue the Reader to note that Bellarmine prooueth that images of God may be made, Lib. 2. cap. 2. cap. 3.

and as he prooueth the ſame, ſo it is their practiſe to paint the Father like an old man, becauſe he ſo appeared to Daniel, yet it is not certen (ſaith he) in the church whether images are to be made or no, out of which confeſsion I conclude, that he teacheth vncertaine doctrine, yea that their Church practiſeth thoſe things which they are not ſure of, and therefore dealeth Antichriſtianly with the people. But I would know of Bellarmine, why the Father may be painted like an old man, and the holy ghoſt like a Doue, ſeeing he cõdemneth the image of the Trinitie painted in forme of a mã, hauing three faces, theſe images (ſaith he) are monſters, and are not the other ſo? if you diſprooue this, then yee likewiſe diſprooue the other: for the painters may as well defende the one as the other. To returne to Lactantius in the ſame chap. and booke, he thus writeth, *Dei in æternum viuentis viuum & ſenſibile debet eſſe ſimulachrum, itaque ſimulachrum Dei non eſt quod digitis hominum fabricatur. God which liueth for euer ought to haue a liuing and ſenſible Image, therefore it is not*

not Gods image which is made with mens hãds. Again, if images are to be worshipped, then the makers of them are much more to be worshipped. *Nam non potest esse quicquã artifice maius. For there can be nothing greater then the workman, who is alwaies better then his worke:* to which Bellarmine answereth, that images are to bee worshipped not for themselues, but for the things which they represent, as if the heathen might not haue said as much and shaped the same answer: yea he is not ashamed to confesse and graunt that man may bee worshipped, if he ment of ciuill worship wee would not contend, but seing he meaneth religious worship, we detest his doctrine; for the reason being strong against the heathen, it is as strong against the papists: and therefore *I* thus conclude it, if images may bee worshipped with religious worship: then may man who is a true image of God be so worshipped; but man ought not so to be worshipped: *Ergo*, neither images. *I* will adioyne moe sayings of Lactantius, *Religio & veneratio nulla alia tenenda est, nisi vnius Dei, no religion & worship is to* Lib. 2. cap. 2. Lib. 1. cap. 20.

be embraced but of god only: Quid igitur opus est tantos sumptus, vel fingēdis, vel colēdis imaginibus impēdere? What need thē is there to bestow so much cost in making of Images, and worshipping them? For, *Nihil colendum est quod mortalibus oculis cernitur: Nothing that is seene with the eyes of man is to bee worshipped;* and that the *Papists* may see how well the Gentiles and they agree, heare the Gentiles defence: *Non ipsa timemus sed eos ad quorum imaginem ficta, & quorum nominibus consecrata sunt, cur igitur oculos ad cœlum non tollitis? cur ad parietes spectatis? We do not adore the Images, but those, whome they represent, and to whome they are dedicated and consecrated, why then doe you not lift vp your eyes to heauen? and why doe you gaze vpon the walles?* Out of this defence of the heathen (as I said before) euery one may gather, that they did not defend their Idolls to be Gods, as Bellarmine would make them; yea we may learne that the *Papists* goe further, then they did, for Bellarmine holdeth that the Images themselues are to bee worshipped, and that they doe *terminare vene-*

Lib. 2. cap. 3.

Lib. 2. cap. 2.

ra-

rationem, worship goeth no further then the image not to the thing which is represented by the image: Thus I haue set downe Lactantius his arguments, which I desire all Papistes to consider without a preiudicate opinion for fauour of them: before I finish this reason I will set downe a syllogisme or two, which I would haue them likewise to think vpon: Bellarmine confesseth that images may accidentally bee worshipped with the same kinde of worship, that the things represented by them are to be worshipped with: out of which I conclude that accidentally there may bee many Gods; that which accidentally hath diuine worship, is accidentally God, but images of God accidentally haue the same worship that God himselfe hath: *ergo* they are accidentally Gods: and if this argument cannot moue them, yet let thē consider that the man cannot bee excused from treason that giueth the proper titles of the kingdome to any vnder this pretence, that he doth it for honour of the King. The Lord (saieth Esay) will not giue his glorie to another, and yet the papists say, he is content *Cap.* 42.

that images by accident haue the same glory, yea why might not the Collyridian heretickes by the same shift excuse their idolatrie, and by as good reason offer cakes to the virgine Marie as the papists doe candels to her: and howsoeuer Bellarmine minceth this point by this sophisticall distinction of accidentall worship, yet doth their church worship the image of Christ and his crosse with the same worship wherewith Christ himselfe is worshipped, so saith the fortresse of their faith, *Crux Christi & eius imago venerari debet veneratione latriæ, & hæc est opinio Thomæ*, *The crosse & image of Christ ought to be worshipped with such honour as is due to God, & of this opinion is Thomas.* Holcoth indeed contradicted this opinion, but the church tooke part with Thomas against him, *Communis opinio tenet oppositum*, *The common opinion holdeth the contrarie*: And why doth their church sing on this manner to the crosse, *O Crux ave spes vnica, auge piis iustitiam, reisque donа veniam*: *Haile crosse our only hope, increase in the godly iustice, and giue the guilty pardon*: But to giue

Lib. 3. cons. 4. art. 24.

that

that honour which is due to Christ to the crosse: For who is so simple as to rest in Bellarmines answere that by *Crosse* is vnderstood Christ himselfe, or els there is a rhetoricall figure, called *a fayning of a person*, this is but to faine an vntrueth: if their church were asked, especially the vulgar people, they know no such meaning. The second syllogisme shalbe this, they which goe on pilgrimage to images, worship images thēselues: but the papists go on pilgrimage to images: *Ergo* they worship the images themselues: to this Bellarmine answereth, *Peregrinationes ad imagines rariores sunt in Ecclesia*, *Pilgrimages to images are not often now vsed in the church*, what they are now I will not dispute, the litle frequēting of pilgrimage cannot dissolue the argument seing the thing is graunted. I leaue the practise of the Iewes who knew the meaning of Gods commandements, and yet [as Cornelius Tacitus witnesseth in his 5. booke of histories.] *Nulla simulachra in templis sunt: they haue no images in their temples*: Onely I wish the reader to consider that Epiphanius is reiected

Vide Aqui. 3. par. qua. 25. art. 4.

of Bellarmine, Augustine is aunswered that he wrote against images when he was first conuerted, and yet he neuer retracted his opinion: Two Councells of Constantinople, one of Franckfurte, and the fourth Councell of Eliberis must all giue place to the idolatrous Councell of Neece: well may Bellarmine by these aunswers perswade his besotted disciples to bee idolaters, but except hee hath better arguments and aunswers euerie learned man will easilie espie his weake defence, and in my iudgement it had bin better both for his credite & conscience that he had neuer defended the worshipping of images, for I doubt not but by reading of him euery one not forestalled may be mooued to the truth.

The

The seuenth reason of Blasphemies.

HAuing evicted the Papists to be guiltie of many grieuous crimes; as Hæresies, Idolatrie &c I come now to Blasphemies which are vttered by men of no small account amongst them: these blasphemies without the rest of the arguments here propounded, I doubt not but beeing throughly weighed by the reader, will leaue such an impression in him, that he shall haue iust cause to take part with God and Christ against the Pope who arrogateth to himselfe a certaine Godhead. I begin first with Bellarmines blasphemous argument; *si nullo modo legem possemus seruare, Deus esset omni tyranno iniquior & crudelior: if we cannot possibly keepe the lawe of god, then God is more cruell, and vnrighteous thē any tyrant.* What dogge would thus barke against god? for that no man can perfectly fulfill Gods commandements I shall prooue *Lib. 2 de Monacap. 13.*

by

by ſuch argumentes and teſtimonies as he cánot accept againſt. To loue God with al our heart, with all our minde, ſoule, & ſtrength, is *angelica perfectio*, an angelicall ſtate of life: but no man can come to angelicall perfection: *Ergo*, no man can fullfill Gods commandements. Secondly we are but *viatores* in this life, i. trauellors, ſo that if we can perfectly fulfill all Gods commandements, there is no difference betwixt the life that we ſhall lead in our countrey, which is heauen, and this pilgrimage in which we nowe are, for beeing in heaven we can but loue God in that manner and meaſure which he requireth. Well ſaith Nazianzen, τὸ μηδὲν ἁμαρτεῖν ὄντως ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον, *not to ſinne is aboue the reach of man*, and Bernard is directly appoſite to Bellarmine, ſaying, *Ergo mandando impoſsibilia, non prævaricatores homines fecit, ſed humiles, vt omne os obſtruatur & accipientes quippe mandatum & ſentientes affectum clamabimus in cælum & miſerebitur noſtri deus: God by commanding impoſsible things made not men tranſgreſſoures of his lawe, but humbleth them that euery mouth*

In his 50 ſermon in cantic.

mouth may be stopped for receiuing a commandement, & feeling our inability to keep it, we cry vnto God and he will haue mercie on vs. What is more plaine then this that god requireth impossible things at our hãds? To Bernard agreeth Augustine. *In mandatis est etiam quod iubemur orare remitte nobis debita nostra, omnia ergo mandata facta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit ignoscitur.* *In Gods commandements we are bidden to pray, forgiue vs our sinnes, therefore all Gods cõmandements are accepted as done, when that which is not done is pardoned.* But why doe I heape vp testimonies of the Fathers? Let their master of Sentences himselfe speake, *cur præcipitur hominibus ista perfectio?* *Why are mẽ commanded this perfectiõ?* he answereth out of Augustine, *quia non rectè curritur, si quo currendum est, nesciatur: because we cannot runne well except we knowe whether we must runne.* So doth Aquinas vse the very same answer by which it is apparent to all mẽ that God commandeth impossible things, and therefore by this blasphemy must be more cruell then any tyrant

Lib. 1 Retr. cap. 19.

Lib. 3. & dist. 27.

2. 2 q. 44. art. 8.

rant, but this might haue beene better borne withall, if they had vttered no moe blasphemous arguments. The Rhemists vpon the first of Timoth. chap. 4. wanting reasons for their prohibition of meates and marriages, know not how to defend their practise but by an argument *à pari*, taken from equalitie: God in paradise did commaund abstinence from one certaine tree, and also did forbidde in the time of the Law certaine degrees of marriage: *ergo* so may the Pope doe: O vnanswerable, nay rather blasphemous consequents! if ye thus dispute without all peraduenture in the ende ye shall haue the victorie. From Bellarmine and the Rhemists I come to their angelical Doctour, who in his supple. 25. *quæ. art.* 1. concludeth thus: *Christus potest, Ergo Paulus potest, Ergo papa potest: Christ can doe it, therefore Paul can doe it, therefore the Pope can doe it.* Make the syllogisme and then the argument will be of greater force: whatsoeuer Christ can doe, that can Paul doe, and whatsoeuer Paul can doe, that can the Pope doe: but Christ can doe this: therefore Paul, and the Pope can

doe

doe it. But why are Paul and the pope ioyned together, seeing his authoritie is deriued from Peter? when Peters keies will not serue, then Pauls sword must saue. To let passe these sensles disputers, heare what is written in the first part of the 6. booke of Decretalls, and 6. title *de electione*, fol. 44. *Papa non est homo, sed vicarius Dei, expressius acius. The pope is not a man, but Gods vicar, more expressely God.* In the proheme of the Clementines and 3. folio, I finde the notation of the pope to be this: *Papa, idest, admirabilis, nec deus es, nec homo, quasi neuter es inter vtrunque. The pope is called so because he is wonderfull, thou art neither god nor man, but as it were a neuter betwixt both.* Againe in the Extravagants fol. 16. tit. 3. *Supposita plenitudine potestatis iuxta quam papæ dici non potest, Domine, cur ita facis. Presupposing the plenarie power by which no man may say to the pope, Master, why doest thou so*, no not though (as it is in another place) he leade innumerable soules with him by heapes to the deuill of hell. Nowe let Panormitan play his part. *Papa & Christus faciunt*

ciunt vnum consistorium. The pope and Christ make one consistorie, *excepto peccato omnia potest quæ deus*, excepting sinne he can do al that God can doe. Also, *papa potest quicquid vult*, the Pope can do what he wil, and therfore *cõtra novũ testamẽtũ potest dispensare*, he may dispense against the new testament. From the Canonists I come to the Alcorã of the Franciscans taken out of their booke of Conformities, *nihil fecit Christus, quod Franciscus non fecit, imo plura fecit quàm Christus, ungues Franciſci tentationem propellunt*. Christ did not any thing but Frances did the same, yea more then Christ, the nailes of frier Frances driue away temptations. *Sicut Ade Deo non parenti omnis creatura libellis extitit. Sic Frãciſco omnia præcepta diuina implenti creatura omnis famulata est, omnia Deus ſubiecit ſub pedibus eius, &c.* As euerie creature rebelled against Adam disobeying God, so all of them serued Frances who fulfilled gods commandemẽt: God hath put all things vnder his feete, he hath made him ruler ouer all the workes of his handes, and he may most worthily say

that

that which is written in the Gospell, *All things are giuen mee of my father*: Can the diuel himselfe speake more spitefully against the God of heauen and earth? I wonder howe the Pope can suffer those things, seing he applyeth the same scriptures to his authority, and therefore sayeth, *Omnis potestas mihi data est in terra, all power is giuen me on earth*: To proceede in the same booke thus they speake of the masse, *Celebratio vnius missæ tantum valet, quantum Christi passio, The saying of one masse is as profitable as Christs passion.* And againe, *si quis deuotè audierit missam non incidit in peccatum mortale*, if any here masse with deuotion he cannot fall into mortall sinne, if this be true why haue the priests so many harlots? nay why are Popish geldings become stone horses? These (Christian reader) are not the tenth of their blasphemies which they haue vomited, but I dare not load thee with any more, least I should he offensiue: I will ende this reason in a word: that religion is a blasphemous religion which maketh not God mercifull, and iust in the highest degree, but

the

the Popish religion maketh not God mercifull and iust in the highest degree: *Ergo* it is a blasphemous religion: the assumption is thus prooued, if the onely mercie of God be not the onely cause of the pardoning of our sinnes, and the alone satisfaction of Christ aunswereth not to Gods iustice then may a finite thing, as mans satisfactions answer the same, & so he shal neither be *summè misericors*, nor *summè iustus*, *neither haue perfect mercy*, nor *perfect iustice*: but the only mercy of God is not the onely cause of the forgiuenesse of our sinnes, neither is his iustice fully satisfied by Christ, but by our owne satisfaction: and therefore he is neither perfectly mercifull, nor perfectly iust. Let god be then as he is is most rich in mercy and absolute in iustice, and the Romish religion cannot stand, for it detracteth from his infinit mercy and iustice, therfore without all controuersie is a blasphemous religion.

The

The eight reason of the Papists owne Confession.

AMongst the properties of truth, this as I proued was one, that it was great and preuaileth, and indeed thorough Gods omnipotent power it is so great that the Aduersaries against themselues confesse the same: so that I may say with the Orator in his oration *pro Quinctio*: *quis nostræ causæ testis idem qui accerrimus aduersarius in hac re inquam aduersarium citabo testem*: *Who beareth witnes to our defence, euen he that is the fiercest aduersary in this defence*: I say I will vse our aduersarie for a witnes, for although I may say to him as the same orator doth in an other oration *pro Fonteio*: *Tuum testimonium quod in aliena re leue est, in tua quoniam contra te est grauissimum esse debet*: *Thy owne testimonie which is of small credit in another matter,*

in thine owne because it is against thy selfe ought to be of exceeding great waight: vpon these triumphs as it were the Christian Reader will be desirous to heare the Papists testimonie, not to hold him therfore any longer in suspence, this is Bellarmines confession in his 7. chap. & 5. book of Iustification, *Propter periculum maius gloriæ tutissimum est fiduciam totam in sola Dei misericordia & benignitate reponere*: by reason of the danger of pride and vaine glorie, it is safest to put our whole confidence onely in the mercy of God, not in our merites or good workes. And this he prooueth out of the 9. chap. of Daniel, *we pray not in our righteousnes, but in thy manifold mercies*: and out of the 17. of Luke, *when you haue done all that you can, you are vnprofitable seruants*: nay out of their owne praiers, *Deus qui conspicis quia ex nulla actione nostra confidimus*: *O God thou seest that vve trust not in any of our actions or vvorkes*: and least these his proofes should not be waightie enough, he quoteth Chrysostome in diuers places, as namely in his 3. homily vpon Matthew writing

ting thus: *Noli mercedem poscere vt accipias mercedem*; require no reward that thou maiest receiue a rewarde. Next followeth Ambrose, *Non sic vixi, vt me pudeat viuere, nec mori timeo quia bonum Dominum habemus*; *I haue so liued that I am not ashamed to liue, neither am I afraide to die, because I haue a mercifull Lord*. After Ambrose followes Augustine, Gregorie, and Bernard: and lastly he vseth this reason: *vel homo habet vera merita vel non habet*, man hath good works in truth, or els he hath thē not in truth but in appearance onely, if onely in appearance then is he dangerously deceiued, if in truth then he looseth nothing, for his trust is onely in God. This is to disanull all his former doctrine, for before he prooued that a man might put his confidence in good workes, because they deserue eternall life; but now he confesseth that it is best to put no cōfidence in works, but only in Gods mercie: out of which I conclude, that it is safest to disclaime our owne merits in the attaining to saluation, and by consequent to be a Protestant. The syllogisme shall be thus

in thine owne because it is against thy selfe ought to be of exceeding great waight: vpon these triumphs as it were the Christian Reader will be desirous to heare the Papists testimonie, not to hold him therfore any longer in suspence, this is Bellarmines confession in his 7. chap. & 5. book of Iustification, *Propter periculum maius gloriæ tutissimum est fiduciam totam in sola Dei misericordia & benignitate reponere*: by reason of the danger of pride and vaine glorie, it is safest to put our whole confidence onely in the mercy of God, not in our merites or good workes. And this he prooueth out of the 9. chap. of Daniel, *we pray not in our righteousnes, but in thy manifold mercies*: and out of the 17. of Luke, *when you haue done all that you can, you are vnprofitable seruants*: nay out of their owne praiers, *Deus qui conspicis quia ex nulla actione nostra confidimus*: *O God thou seest that vve trust not in any of our actions or vvorkes*: and least these his proofes should not be waightie enough, he quoteth Chrysostome in diuers places, as namely in his 3. homily vpon Matthew writing

ting thus: *Noli mercedem poscere vt accipias mercedem*; require no reward that thou maiest receiue a rewarde. Next followeth Ambrose, *Non sic vixi, vt me pudeat viuere, nec mori timeo quia bonum Dominum habemus*; *I haue so liued that I am not ashamed to liue, neither am I afraide to die, because I haue a mercifull Lord*. After Ambrose followes Augustine, Gregorie, and Bernard: and lastly he vseth this reason: *vel homo habet vera merita vel non habet*, man hath good works in truth, or els he hath thē not in truth but in appearance onely, if onely in appearance then is he dangerously deceiued, if in truth then he looseth nothing, for his trust is onely in God. This is to disanull all his former doctrine, for before he prooued that a man might put his confidence in good workes, because they deserue eternall life; but now he confesseth that it is best to put no cōfidence in works, but only in Gods mercie: out of which I conclude, that it is safest to disclaime our owne merits in the attaining to saluation, and by consequent to be a Protestant. The syllogisme shall be thus

framed. It is safest to put no confidence in workes: but this is the Protestants constant doctrine: *ergo* it is safest to be a Protestant: and indeede it hath beene alwaies iudged the part of a wise man to encline *in eam partem quæ cautior est*, into that defence which is best, but our defence is best by the aduersaries own confession: *ergo* it is the wisest part to holde with the Protestants. So now I may iustly vse the Orators exclamatiō in his oration *pro Cælio: ô magna vis veritatis quæ contra hominū ingenia, calliditatē, solertiā, &c ô mighty power of truth, who doth defend it selfe against the wit, craft, & subtiltie of men.* I will end this reason with some sayings of Hierom, because his authoritie hath not bin yet vsed in this matter: in his 3. book against the Pelagians he writeth thus, *Nec in sapientia nostra, nec in vllis virtutibus confidendum, sed in solo domino: we trust neither in our wisdome, nor in any vertues, but onely in the Lord*: and in his dialogue against the Luciferians, *Credo & tamen secundum fidem meam fieri nolo, (retenim sit peribo: I beleeue, yet I vvould not*

haue it be according to my beleefe, for then I periſh: So muſt euery Chriſtian ſay if it be according to our workes wee periſh, but we truſt onely to the mercie of God: therefore looke and waite for ſaluation. To this confeſsion of *Bellarmine* I might likewiſe haue adioyned *Steuen Gardiners*, but Bellarmine being the papiſts *Pythagoras* ſhal ſerue in ſtead of all. And now for a concluſion of this point and reaſon, let any papiſt anſwer me what harme can come of the Proteſtats doctrine? if they ſay good works are come to a downefall by it, I would haue yeelded but that S. Paul in the 2. of the Galat. ver. 17. many hundered yeares ago hath anſwered this rotten and ſtale obiection, *If we that ſeeke for iuſtification by Chriſt, be found ſinners in Chriſt, is Chriſt the miniſter of ſinne? God forbid, &c.* by which place of holy Scripture this friuolous cauill is ſo plainely confuted, that the Papiſts (except they cannot reſolue the Apoſtles argument) might as well haue charged *Pauls* doctrine with diſſolutenes as they do ours, therfore I deſire all men to holde that which is ſafeſt, which is

the part of a wise man to doe. But it is safest to hold as we hold, and it is the part of wise men to defende the best part, which is ours: *Ergo*, it is safest to hold with: and why was the Phatise cõdemned vs but for putting his confidence in workes? he acknowledged them to come from God, saying, *I thanke thee that I am not as other men are, I fast twise in a weeke, I giue tith of all that I haue.* It we giue thanks to god for thole his good actions and workes, then by necessarie consequent it may be concluded that he ascribed thẽ not to himselfe, but to the giuer & fountaine of all good things, yet hath he Christs owne testimony against him, for what thẽ but for his affiance in his workes. Thus the Papists by their owne doctrine of confidẽce in workes become Pharisees: also I see not why they may not say to god as the Iewes did, why do we fast, & thou doest not regard vs? why doe we afflict our soules and thou doest not acknowledge vs? Better it is to pray with the Prophet David, *Enter not into iudgement O Lord with thy seruants, for no flesh is righteous in thy sight*. To which

Luk. 18. v. 11

Psal. 143. v. 3

place

place of Scripture Bellarmine answereth that it is to be vnderstood, *ad comparationē Dei*, in comparison of God, and so conteuteth himselfe with the answer of Pelagius as I prooue out of Hierom in his booke *ad Ctesip. Non iustificabitur in conspectu Dei omnis vivens quod testimonium sub nomine pietatis eludunt, aiunt enim ad comparationem dei nullum esse perfectum, quasi hoc dicat scriptura, quando enim dicit in conspectu tuo hoc intelligi vult quod etiam qui hominibus sancti videntur, dei scientiæ atque notitiæ nequaquam sunt sancti.* No mā liuing shall be iustified in thy sight, which testimony vnder the pretēce of piety they delude, for they say that no man is perfect in respect of God, as if this were the meaning of the scripture, for whē it saith (in thy sight) it giueth vs to vnderstand, that those which seeme holy to men, in gods sight and knowledge are not holy. Out of this testimony it appeareth that the papists accepting of Pelagius his answer, ioyne not onely with the Pharises in this point, but also with the Pelagiās of whose heresie I haue spoke before.

Tom. 1. lib de Mona. cap. 13

I dare not stay any longer in this reason, lest I forget my selfe promising to haue ended it before, but the laying open of the Papists Phariseisme and Pelagianisme I hope will ad some weight to it, and therefore I haue dwelt a litule the longer in it.

The ninth reason of the practise of the Primitiue Church.

ALthough I might be very long in shewing the practise of the primitiue Church to be repugnant to popery, yet I will eude this reason with all possible brevity. Eusebius in his 4. booke of his Ecclesiasticall history, and 14. chapter, writeth thus of the people of Smyrna, who by the malitious Iewes were esteemed as worshippers of Policarpus: *Iudei nostros intentis oculis obseruarunt, ne eum à flammis ad-*

adhuc ardentibus raperent ignorantes, quia neque Christum aliquando possemus derelinquere, qui mortem pro totius mundi salute sustinuit, neque alium quenquã colere quoniam eum verum deum, & qui solus colendus sit noverimus, martyres vero tanquam discipulos diligimus quasi integrè fidem magistro seruantes & domino, quorum nos quoque in fidei perseverantia & charitatis optamus esse participes. The Iewes watched vs diligently least we should haue taken him out of the fire being ignorant, that neither we can leaue Christ which hath suffered for all that are saued in the world, neiworshippe any other, for him we adore as beeing God, but the Martyrs as disciples and fellowes of our Lord, we loue worthily for their exceeding good will vnto their king and master, of whose charitie in faith and perseuerance God graunt we may be partakers. This testimony sheweth howe the Papists are departed from this practise, who do not only loue, but most superstitiously adore the reliques of Saints: the christiãs were charged as you may see in *Iustins* 2. apo. to

be

be ἄθεοι, that is, Atheists, not to worship God, to whom he answereth, *Profitemur nos quidem talium qui habentur deorum esse expertes & atheos, sed non verissimi illius dei patris videlicet virtutum expertes, verum hūc ipsum & qui ab illo venit filium, & spiritum propheticum colimus & adoramus cum ratione & veritate venerantes. We professe our selues to be vvithout such as are accounted Gods, and indeed to be Atheists, but not without the most true God the father of vertues, for we worship and adore him and his sonne, and the holy ghost in truth and as reason requireth.* Out of which answer I gather that the Christians did not worship Saints, Angels, or other things, for then Iustine might haue answered that the Christians worshipped many Gods, as the heathen did, especially if they worshipped as many as the Papists who exceed the Gentiles, or at leastwise are nothing behinde them in their idolatrie: and if these two will not content the Papists in this point, let Origen speak: *Solus Deus adorandus est, preces offerendæ soli vnigenito Dei verbo, qui vt pontifex eas ad Deum su-*

8. Booke contra Celsum p. 937.

um

um & Deum noſtrum perferat. God alone is to be adored, to the onely begotten ſonne of God our praiers are onely to be offered, vvho as high prieſt offereth them to his and our God. And againe, *Oblitus cum Chriſtianis ſe agere ſoli Deo per Ieſum preces offerentibus: Hee forgetteth himſelfe that he hath to doe with Chriſtians who offer their praiers only to God by Chriſt Ieſus.* Theſe teſtimonies of Origen do euidently manifeſt vnto vs, what was the approoued vſe of the church in his time, *viz.* that their praiers were not made vnto Angels nor Saints, but onely to God in the name of Ieſus Chriſt, neither haue we the practiſe of the primitiue Church onely in this point but in many moe, which I will in a worde declare. The Chriſtians were charged by the Pagans for hauing no images, and they not onely confeſſed ſo much, but alſo defended it as moſt agreeable to the law of God. Origen, *Contra Celſum lib. 8.* Pag. 934. *poſtheæc Celſus ait nos ararum, ſtatuarum, templorumq; dedicationes fugere, non videns pro arris ſuam eſſe mentem cuique ex qua ſurſum feruntur verè & intelligibiliter ſuauer-*

olentes

olentes ſuffitus, ſimulachra autem Deo dicanda ſunt non fabrorum opera, ſed à verbo Dei dedolata & formata in nobis, viz. virtutes ad imitationem primogeniti totius ei naturæ, hæ ſunt ſtatuæ Deo dicatæ. Furthermore Celſus affirmeth that vvee haue no dedication of Altars, ſtanding Images and Temples, not knovving that euerie man inſteede of an Altar hath a minde, out of vvhich are ſent ſpirituall ſvvet-ſmelling perfumes, and as touching Images ſuch are dedicated to god as are not the vvorkes of artificers, but are framed of the word of god in vs, namely vertues to the imitation of the firſt begotten of euery creature, thoſe are the images that are dedicated to god. Againe in his 7. booke pag. 928. *Multa adeò nos prohibent ab aris & ſimulachris, vt emori citius iubeant, quàm contaminemus noſtram de Deo fidē talibus impietatibus. There are ſo many prohibitions againſt Altars & Images, that men are commaunded rather to die, then to defile their faith which they haue of god with ſuch impiety.* Out of which two teſtimonies as I conclude againſt images, ſo may

likewise against Altars, and then what will become of the popish sacrifice of the masse? Not to rest onely in the authoritie of Origen, heare what Clemens Alexandrinus saith in his exhortation to the Gentiles, ἡμῖν δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀισθητὸς, &c. *Nobis non est imago sensilis de materia sensili, sed quæ percipitur intelligentia: Wee haue no image that is materiall and seene vvith eyes, but onely such as is conceaued with vnderstanding*: I let passe Lactantius his testimony because I haue bin long in it before, and vse Arnobius authority in whose 8. booke, the heathen do moue this question, *Cur nullas aras habent, nulla tẽpla, nulla notа simulachra, why haue they no Altars, no Temples, no knowen Images?* of these testimonies I may say with the Orator, *Aut hoc testium satis est aut ne scio quid satis est, Either these are sufficient witnesses, or els I know not what is sufficient.* But I come now to a third practise of the church repugnant and opposite to poperie, which was to haue publike praiers in a knowen tongue: Iustine in his second apologie ἐν τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου, *& in solis qui dicitur die omnium qui vel in oppi-*

dis,

dis, vel ruri degunt in eundem locum conuentus fit, & commentaria Apostolorum, aut scripta Prophetarum leguntur, quoad tempus patitur: On the day which is called Sunday all that are in townes or villages meet together in one place where the writings of the Apostles or Prophets are read as the houre permitteth vs. When the reader ceaseth, the parson warneth and exhorteth vs to imitate the good things that haue bin read vnto vs, then arise we all & ioyntly make our praiers after which ended, bread and wine with water are brought to the place, and he that is chiefe amongst vs giueth thanks in the best manner he can: and a litle before, *Perfectis precibus & gratiarum actione, populus omnis qui adest benedicit dicens Amen*: at the ende of his praiers and thanks, all the people that are present do blesse and say *Amen*. *Amen* in hebrew signifieth as much as God graunt it may bee so. If they desire plainer words let them heare Origen *lib.* 8. *cont. Celsum pag.* 941. *Sciant quod germanè Christiani, ne vsitatis quidem Dei nominibus in sacra scriptura vtuntur inter precandum, sed Græci*

Græcis

Græcis, Romani Romanis, ſingulique precantur in propria lingua, deumq; celebrant pro viribus, & omnium linguarum Dominus, omnibus linguis precantes exaudit tàm variè loquẽtes haud ſecus ac cõſonos &c. Let mẽ knowe that true Chriſtians doe not vſe in their praiers the names of god which are vſed in holy ſcripture, but greeks do vſe greek names, Romanes vſe Latine names, and men of euery nation pray and praiſe god with all their might in their owne mother tongue, and the Lord of al tongues doth heare them praying in all tongues vnderſtanding them that ſpeake diuerſly no otherwiſe then if they were men of one ſpeech and language. I might here alleadge the 15. Canon of the Councell of Laodicia which ordained that none ſhould ſing but thoſe that were Canonically elected, *& qui de Codice legunt*, and thoſe that read out of their books, by which it appeareth that ſome of the people could reade the Pſalmes and by conſequent had them in their owne tongue. But let Baſill ende the third difference, who writeth, that in the church the people did ἀντέλεγεν ἀλλήλοις *Epiſt. 80. ad Caterinæ.*

that

that is, answer one another in singing: and this was the māner and custome of all churches, πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ: *mos qui nunc obtinet omnibus Dei Ecclesiis consonus est & consentaneus: the custome which novve preuaileth is agreeable to all churches*: and after this he rehearseth the Aegyptians, Thebans, Arabians, Syrians, and Chaldæans. So then now I hold it needeles in so cleare and manifest a matter, to quote mo testimonies, for I might haue vsed Augustines, Chrysostomes, Hieromes, and Ambroses authority for the proofe of this practise, but eschuing tediousnes I will now propound the fourth Difference. The people in the primitiue Church were not depriued of the cuppe in the Communion, so testifieth Clemens Alexandrinus, εὐχαριστίαν τινὲς διανειμάντες, ὡς ἔθος, αὐτὸν δὲ ἕκαστον τοῦ καὶ λαβεῖν τὴν μοῖραν ἐπιτρέπουαν. *Some distributing the Eucharist doe suffer the people as the custome is to take part*. This testimonie also ouerthroweth the priests priuate Communion, which I might haue made an other difference, but that for breuitie sake I spare to speake of it. To Clemens

Lib. 1. Στρωμ.

mens I adioyne Iustine in his 2. Apol. *qui apud nos diaconi vocantur dant vnicuique eorum qui adsunt partem panis pro quo gratiæ actæ sunt & vini & aquæ participandam: they which we call deacons giue to all that are present a part of consecrated bread and wine mingled with water to be receiued.* Here I might abound with testimonies, and time would sooner faile me then proofes, and therefore I take and accept the confession of Duræus, who beeing pressed with the authority of Gelasius, who commanded that sacraments should be either wholly receiued or wholly omitted, confesseth that for foure hundred yeeres it was so vsed in the Church, I will not stand to shew that it was longer continued, but I demand why that which was so long practised in the Church, should be disanulled by the Counsell of Constance, were the Fathers in that counsel wiser then all the Christians in so many ages, yea then the Apostles and Christ himselfe? The fift difference is that the Christians were not burdened with many festiuall daies: Celsus obiecting to the Church the 936. p.

want of feasts is answered by Origen, *Festum is facere officium.* id est, *a feast is to doe a duty*, & proueth it out of the fourth of the Galat: that daies are not to be kept excepting the Lordes day, Easter and Pentecost; what then is become of the multitude of the Popish festiuall daies wherewith the Church is grieuously burdened, concerning this point Erasmus writeth thus vpon Matthew 11. cap. *Aetas, Hieronimi præter diem dominicum paucissima noverat festa. In Hierom his time there vvas very fevve festiuall daies besides the Lords day.* And in the tripartite history in the ninth booke, & the thirtie eight chapter I finde these wordes, *Mens fuit Apostolorum non de diebus sancire festivitatem, sed conversationē rectam & Dei prædicare culturam: It vvas not the Apostles meaning to giue lavves concerning festiuall daies, but to preach a holy conversation and the worship of God.* To leaue this practise and come to the sixt difference namely of fasting, I finde likewise that the Church left it free, and imposed no necessity vpon men to obserue the Lent fast, *Quidam*

(saith

saith Eusebius) *putant vno tantum die obser-* Lib.5.cap.24
vari debere ieiunium, alii duobus, alij vero pluribus, nonnulli etiam quadraginta, ita vt horas diurnas nocturnasque computantes diem statuant; *some thought they ought to fast one day, some two daies, some more, some fourtie daies, and counting the houres of the day and night, make vp the daye.* Also, *Ieiunii dissolentia fidei vnitatem commendat. The diuersitie of fasting commendeth the vnitie of faith.* To Eusebius agreeth Socrates saying. *in ipsis ieiunijs aliter apud alios obseruari inuenimus, Romani enim tres ante Pascha septimanas ieiunant, tota Hellas, Alexandria quoque sex septimanas antè ieiunant. We finde difference in the obseruation of fasts themselues, the Romãs fast three weekes before Easter, all Greece and Alexandria 6. weekes.* Memorable is the practise of Spirid. in the same hist. 1. lib. 12. cap. who said that *omnia munda mũdis, al things are cleane to the cleane:* & therefore in *quadragesima edebat carnes porcinas, In lent he fed vpõ bacon.* Lastly good is the aduise of Nazi. in his oration of Baptisme: *Christus quadraginta*

dies ieiuna vit, nos nostris viribus mensuremus τῇ δυνάμει τοῦτο συμμετρήσωμεν. *Christ fasted forty daies, let vs measure it according to our ability.* Out of all these testimonies it is apparent to all men that there was no vniformity in fasting, and therefore the Papists are degenerate in this point also frō the ptimitiue Church, because they impose a necessity of abstinence from flesh permitting fish, for (as we may reade in the places before cited) some vsed to feed on flesh in the time of lent. Many moe differences, as namely the libertie of ministers in marriage, the reading of the scriptures &c. might I haue stood vpō, but for breuity sake hoping that these differences here recited will satisfy a Christian, I leaue them, and say with our Sauiour Christ, *It was not so from the beginning* as the Papists would beare mē in hāde, and therefore they are to reforme their religion, for as Cyprian saith ad Pomp. *consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est: custome without trueth is but an auncient error.*

Mtah. 19. v. 8

The

The tenth reason of Scripture.

IF I should in this reason prosecute all thinges that argue the desperate case of popish religion; my treatise would exceede the measure of the volume which I propounded to my selfe: therefore in a word I come first to the abusing of Scripture by vngodly translations. In the 1. chapter of the epistle to the Hebrewes, & 3. verse, it is said, *that Christ purged our sinnes by himselfe*, which words (*by himselfe*) are cleane stricken out, as ouerthrowing their blasphemous doctrine of satisfactions: for they teach, that Christ satisfieth by the repentant, whereas the Scripture saieth, that hee satisfieth by himselfe. *In* the same Epistle, the 7. chapter, and 28. verse, it is written, that the law appointeth priests men that haue infirmity, but the word of the oth which is after the lawe, the sonne for euer

perfected: where by the opposition it is most cleare, that Iesus Christ is a *Priest* as hee is God. Yet they contrarie to their latine translation haue left out the word [*men*] that the opposition might not appeare. Againe, in the thirteene chapter and 16. verse: their translation is thus, *with such hostes God is promerited*: doth not this make for their doctrine of deseruing at Gods hands? where as it is in the greeke fountaine, τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός: that is, *with such sacrifices god is delighted, or well pleased*. To what a desperate estate are these mē grown, which so wilfully against their owne consciences, in fauour of their heresies, translate the Scripture. Is there no difference betwixt pleasing of God, and meriting? All the substances and qualities of things naturall, please God because they are good, yet doe they not deserue at God his hands. Againe in the fourteene chapter of Saint Iohn and the twentie sixe verse their translation hath it thus, *Suggeret vobis omnia quæcunq; dixero vobis*, which they finely english thus, *Shall suggest vnto you what soeuer I shall say*

vnto

vnto you, when they knowe the greek hath πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν, *all things vvhich I haue ſpoken vnto you*. Is not this tranſlated to maintaine the traditions of their Church, and decrees of Popes, and counſailes? That it is ſo, it appeareth by their note, referring the reader to the 16. chapter, and 12. verſe. Vpon which they haue gathered their traditions: but Saint Auguſtine vpon that verſe anſwereth them, *Cum ipſe tacuerit, vvhen he himſelfe hath not vttered theſe things, vvhich of vs can ſay, theſe, and theſe they are? or if he dare be ſo bold to ſay, how doth he proone it?* In the tenth chapter of Luke & the thirtie fiue verſe, the vulgar latine hath it thus, *Quodcunque ſuperogaueris, ego cum redíero, reddam tibi*, which they haue tranſlated thus, *what ſoeuer thou ſhalt ſupererogate &c.* Hence are gathered works of ſupererogation, it is in the greeke: *what ſoeuer thou ſpendeſt more*. Theſe (to ſpeake the leaſt of them) are both ſupererogant collections, and ſuperarogant works. To proceed in the 11. of the Rom. and 6. verſe, theſe words are omitted, *but if it bee of vvorks, it is no more*

of grace, or els were worke no vvorke, the dashing out of this sentence, helpeth their doctrine of merits, let it alone in the scripture, and grace and merits cannot stand together: for here we may gather, that *gratia non est vllo modo gratia, nisi sit omni modo gratuita*, *grace is not grace except it be euery way free.* In the 5. to the Ephes. they translate *Sacramentum hoc magnum est*, *this is a great Sacrament*: Out of which the maister of the Sentences *lib.* 4. *distinct.* 26 prooueth mariage to be a Sacrament: the greeke is, *This is a great misterie, or secret*, which Saint Paul speaketh, and meaneth of Christ, and his Church. (Not to quote many testimonies) let Cyprian that famous Martyr speak in his 2. booke of Epist. the 8. epist. *Cum Apostolus dicit Sacramentum, hoc magnum est Christi, pariter & Ecclesiæ vnitatem in diuiduis nexibus cohærentem, sancta sua voce testatur*, *When the Apostle saieth this is a great Sacrament he testifieth the vnitie of Christ & his holy Church knitt together, with vndinisible bondes.* I cannot let passe that intollerable translation, Romanes the seuenth and the

25. verse. Where S. Paule crying out, *O miserable man that I am, who shall deliuer me from this body of sinne?* in the next verse they translate, *the grace of Christ*, concluding out of it, that grace is sufficient to resist temptations and to vanquish sinne, where the Apostle saith no more, but *I thanke god*, yet they make the meaning to be this, who shall deliuer me from this body of death: the the grace of God by Iesus Christ; whereas there is no such meaning: for Paul hauing sorrowed for his sinne, rested in the hope which he had placed in Christ. Furthermore in the 1. to the Corinth. the ninth cap. and 5. verse, they haue peruerted S. Pauls wordes, whereas he sayeth, a sister, a wife, or (as they would haue it) a sister, a womā, they make it to be a woman, a sister, expounding it against the Apostles wiues, whereas no man would say a sister, a woman, because the word sister implieth a woman. We read indeede that certaine women did follow Christ, we read not that he led them about. Concerning this matter Clemens Alexandrinus writeth thus. *An & Apostolos* — *vide Eusebium lib. 3. ca. 30.*

im.

improbant? Petrus enim ac Philippus vxores habuerunt. Doe they disalovv the Apostles? for Peter and Philip had wiues. And it grieueth not Paul in a certaine epistle to speake of his yoake-fellow, which he did not lead about with him, that he might be more readie to preach the gospel. But to come to a waightie matter indeede, they translate the 2. verse of the 3. chap. of Matth. *Doe penance*, which cannot be so turned, and that I prooue by these reasons: First pe-

1 nance includeth in it confession of sinnes, and satisfaction for sinnes: but the baptized are not bounde to confesse and satisfie for their sinnes, yet they must repent: therefore

Aquin. 3. p. q. 68. ar. 5, 6. to confesse and satisfie, is not to repent. The

2 second reason is this: that the Rhemists writing vpon the first of Mark and 12. v. saith, that *Christ did penance*, therefore a man may doe penance without sorow for sinnes, or else Christ repented of his sinnes which

3 is most horrible blasphemie. Thirdly let

L. 6. cap. 24. Lactantius speake, *μετανοία resipiscentia dicitur, nam mentem quae ab insania recipit. The Greeke word is called Repentance,*

for

for it recouereth the minde (as it were) from follie. Fourthly, Act. the 5. chap. and 31. verſ. they tranſlate it themſelues, *Repentance*, and againe Marke the 1. chap. and 15. verſe, *be penitent.* I will not ſtand vpon any moe places in the newe Teſtament, but come to a fewe of the olde. In the ninth of the *Preacher* and ſecond verſe they haue theſe wordes, *Omnia in futurum ſervantur incerta, All things are reſerued as vncertain for the future time*: there is no ſuch thing in the Hebrew, yet out of this place is prooued the vncertentie of ſaluation and finall perſeuerance. O moſt wretched and vile doctrine that muſt coyne ſcripture to defende it ſelfe! In the 98. pſalme and 5. verſe they tranſlate, *vvorſhippe his footeſtoole, for it is holy*, and from hence conclude the adoration and worſhipping of creatures, whereas it ſhould haue beene turned, *at his footeſtoole he is holy, lahadom* the ſame thing being repeated in the laſt verſe. In the 8. of Geneſis toward the ende of the chap. where it ſhould be, *the thoughts of mans heart*

are

are euill, in their tranſlation it is *prone to euill*, as if there were no difference betwixt prone to euill, and euill. If I ſhould affirme a papiſt to be prone to euill, and treaſon, doe I ſay that he is euill, and treaſon it ſelfe? nothing leſſe: euen ſo there is a difference betwixt proneſſe to vice, and vice it ſelfe. In the 14. of Geneſis, and 18. verſe, they haue it thus *erat enim ſacerdos dei altiſſimi, for he was a prieſt of the moſt high God*, in fauour of their ſacrifice: where it is, *and he vvas a prieſt of the high God*, neither let them aunſwere me that the coniunction (*vau*) doeth ſometimes ſignifie (for) that is not the queſtion, but whether it ſo ſignifieth in this place. And becauſe they vaunte of antiquitie, in this point, Freculph. in the firſt booke of his hiſtorie, and 42 chap. ſaith, that *Melchizedech, in refectionem ipſius Abrahæ, panem, vinumque protulit. Melchizedech brought forth bread and wine for the refreſhing of Abraham.* I will follow this matter of tranſlations no further at this time. By this euery one may gather why they forſake the pure Hebrewe, and Greeke fountaines,

taines, and drinke of the corrupt Latin ſtreames.

I come in the ſecond place to the denial of plaine Scriptures. In the 3. of the Galat. and 10. ver. it is thus written, *for as many as are of the deedes of the law, are vnder the curſe: for it is written, curſed is euery one that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the law, to doe them*: in which words the Apoſtle doth thus reaſon,

They which cannot fulfill the law are vnder the curſe:

But no man can fulfill the law: *ergo*.

If this be not the Apoſtles aſſumption, the Galatians might haue anſwered Paul, that they could fulfil the law, and therefore were not vnder the curſe. Yet the Papiſts teach, that man may fulfil Gods law, and ſo cut the ſinewes of S. Pauls reaſon. Secondly in the 4. to the Rom. and 11. verſe, circumciſion is called *a ſeale of the righteouſnes of faith*: out of which place we gather, that we are not iuſtified by the ſacraments. The Papiſts to elude the place, anſwer it followeth not that it is ſo in all, becauſe it was ſo in the patriarchs:

triarchs; this anſwer diſioynteth the Apoſtles argument, which is this:

As *Abraham* was iuſtified, ſo are all men iuſtified:

But *Abraham* was iuſtified without the ſacraments:

Therefore all men are ſo iuſtified.

In the 6. of the Rom. and 27. ver. it is ſaide that *the gift of God is eternall life, through Ieſus Chriſt our Lord.* S. Pauls ſpeach is corrected by the Rhemiſts, ſaying, the ſequele of the ſpeach required, that as he ſaide, death or damnation is the ſtipend of ſinne, ſo life euerlaſting is the ſtipende of iuſtice. To ſee papiſts ſit as it were in iudgement of the Scriptures, to alow, or diſalow ſentences at their pleaſure, is the moſt notorious example of Hereticall pride and miſerie that can be. Againe, in the 6. to the Rom. and 12. v. *concupiſcence is called ſinne*, yet denied by them to be ſinne. If the ſcripture had ſo ſaid, they might well haue expounded it as they doe, namely the occaſions and matter of ſinne. But cānot one thing be properly ſinne, and the occaſion of ſinne? let Auguſtine then

be

be controlled, who in his 5. book *contra Iul. Pelag.* and 3. chap. writeth thus, *Sicut cæcitas cordis, & peccatum eſt, & pœna peccati, & cauſa peccati: ita concupiſcentia carnis & peccatum eſt, quia ineſt illi inobedientia contra dominatum mentis, & pœna peccati, & cauſa peccati. As blindnes of heart is ſinne, and a puniſhment of ſinne, and a cauſe of ſinne: ſo likewiſe is concupiſcence ſinne, becauſe it diſobeieth the rule of the minde, and a puniſhment of ſinne, and a cauſe of ſinne.* Auguſtines ſyllogiſme is this: That which is diſobedience to the gouernment of the minde is ſinne: But concupiſcence is diſobedience to the gouernement of the minde: Therefore concupiſcence is ſinne.

Alſo in the 5. of the Roman. and 14. verſ. Paul prooueth all men to be ſinners, becauſe of death; yet is the virgin Marie exempted from ſinne, which ſtrengtheneth Pelagius his opinion. For he might denie the argument; Infants die, therefore they are no ſinners, becauſe Marie died, and yet was no ſinner. In the 1. to the Corinthians and 10. chap. S. Paul beateth downe the conceit of

the

the Corinthians cõcerning the ſacraments. For the Iewes did eate Chriſt in their ſacraments. Yet the Papiſts will haue our ſacraments to giue grace *ex opere operato, of the worke wrought*, and ſo make the Apoſtles argument to be of no force. For the Corinthians might haue replied, our ſacraments giue grace to them that receiue them, therfore we cannot be diſmaied, with the examples of the Iſraelites. Furthermore in the 9. of the Hebrewes the 25. verſ. Chriſt is ſaid *to haue offered himſelfe but once*, becauſe he ſuffered but once. The Apoſtles reaſon is this: *Chriſt died but once: Therefore he ſuffered but once.*

Laſtly, Hebr. 10. and 18. ver. the Apoſtles concluſion is, *ſeeing there is remiſsion of ſinnes, there is no more offering for ſinne.* Therefore it followeth inuincibly, that the maſſe is not a ſacrifice for ſinne. Yet the papiſts aſſertion muſt needes fruſtrate both theſe arguments of the Apoſtle. From the deniall of ſcripture I come to the addition of the ſame, which argueth extreame deſperatenes. The Councell of Laodicea 59. ca-

non

non reiecteth the books which we doe and commandeth *ne aliqui præterea legantur, & in authoritatem recipiantur, that non besides be read, and receiued into authority.* Ruffinus likewise in his exposition vpon the Creede, reiecteth the same, and will not haue them alleadged, *ad authoritatem fidei confirmandam, for the confirmation of faith.* Cirill of Hierusalem in the 4. booke of his Catech. writeteth thus. *Lege scripturas sacras nempe viginti duos veteris testamenti libros, read the holy scriptures, namely the two and twentie bookes of the old testament.* I passe ouer Hieroms authority, and Nazianzens, with Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Lyraes: If al these will not mooue them, yet let their Angelicall doctor Thomas Aquinas be of some force with them, who in his first *part. 89. quæst. 8. artic. resp. ad secund.* regardeth not the authoritie of Ecclesiasticus. Fourthly and lastly the concealing of the scriptures from the people, what end hath it, but maintenance of the Idolatrie, pompe, pride and couetousnes of the popish priests

and prelats, (as Erasmus saith) *Quis non intelligat istos, sacras literas ideo velle paucis esse notas ne quid detrahat ipsorum authoritati quæstuique?* who knoweth not that these men would haue the scriptures knowne but to few, least their authority and gaine should decay? How could men be deceiued with Images, and robbed with Purgatory, if they were conuersant in the scriptures? Thus Christian reader I haue giuen thee a tast of foure notorious crimes, namely: corrupt translations, deniall of plaine scriptures, addition to them, and lastly concealing them frō the people: a tast I say I haue giuen thee, for I could not prosecute them as the things require. If any Papist could shewe the like in the Caluinists, what exclamations should we haue? Master Martins discouery of our translations argueth either blinde ignorance or extreame malice, as I offer to prooue to any Papist. Campian in his first reason obiecteth diffidence, and distrust, because we denie scriptures, therefore it is a sure conclusion against them, they adde to

Scripture and so distrust their cause: otherwise they could not adde any Apocripha bookes, as they doe: but inough of this.

The eleuenth reason of popish contradictions.

THe number of popish cõtradictions is so great (as by reading of Bellarmine himselfe euery man may gather) that I may saye with the Orator, *In hac causa oratio nemini deesse potest*, *In this matter no man can want words*, & therefore, *non tàm mihi copia, quàm modus in dicendo quærendus est*, *In speaking of this thing I must seeke for a iust measure, not for plentie and varietie of matter*. Chrastouius in his booke, called *Bellum Iesuiticum*, *the Iesuites warre*, besides contradictions concerning Antichrist hath gathered two hundred and fiftie about the Masse. Thus the Papists like the Madianites wound on ano-

ther, and indeed, *Non tanta nobiscum, quanta secum est contentio*, *The controuersie is not so great with vs as with themselues*, and this agreeth to the wonted and accustomed dealing of the Lord: who did, *Hæreticos inter se committere*, *set hereticks togither by the eares*. For (as Hierome saieth) Amos the 9. *Nisi superbiam hæreticorum suo dominus calcauerit pede, & peruersam scelerataque doctrinam, spirituali mucrone percusserit, & magistros eorum qui in capitibus accipiuntur, inter se diuiserit, atque in bonam partem occiderit, non possunt discipuli viuificari, except the Lord tyed downe the pride of hereticks with his foote, and wound their peruerse and wicked doctrin with his spiritual sword, and set their masters which are counted the principall at dissention, and slay them for the most part, their schollers cannot bee restored to life.*

The first contradiction.

The Papists teach that the Pope, as he is Pope cannot erre in giuing of sentence, although he may erre as a priuate person, yet Alphonsus who wrote bitterly against Luther,

Lib. 1. cap. 4.

ther, when it came to this point, giueth the Papists both the crime of impudencie, and flatterie: *Non credo aliquem adeo esse impudentem papæ assentatorem, vt ei attribuere hoc velit, vt nec errare possit: I cannot thinke any man to be so impudent a flatterer of the Pope, as to attribute this vnto him that hee cannot erre:* out of these words I gather first that the papists are the Popes flatterers, Secondly, that their flattery is ioyned with impudencie, which are two no small faultes: to goe foreward in Alphonsus *Cælestinum papam errasse circa matrimonium fidelium, quorum alter labitur in hæresim, res est manifesta omnibus, neque hic Cælestini error talis fuit, qui soli negligentiæ imputari debuit, ita vt illum errasse dicamus veluti priuatam personam, & non vt Papam, quoniam huiusmodi Cælestini definitio habebatur in antiquis decretalibas, &c. It is a thing manifest to all mẽ that Pope Cælestinus erred touching the marriage of the faithfull, vvhen either part fell into heresie, neither was the error of Cælestinus such, as ought to be imputed onely to negligence, so that wee may say he erred as*

a priuate person, not as a Pope, because this definition of Cælestinus was in the auncient decretalls, which I my selfe haue seene and read. In this sentence Alphonsus confuteth the distinction vsed by the papists, namely that the Pope may erre as a priuate man, but not in a definitiue decision of a matter: but I would gladly knowe the cause why they hold that the Pope cannot iudicially erre? Is it not by reason of Christs praier? Luke 22. verse 32. who prayed that Peters faith might not faile; such senslesse disputes are not worth an answer: yet if they will be satisfied let Cyprian satisfie them, who writeth thus in his 4. booke of Epist. and 4. Epist. *Adeo autem pro nobis deprecabatur, vt legamus in alio loco,* Luc. 12. *Dixit Dominus ad Petrum &c. Quod si ille pro nobis ac delictis nostris laborat & prec. &c. He prayed so for vs, as we read in another place, namly* Luk. 12. *the Lord said vnto Peter, &c. If he doth pray so for vs and our sinnes, how much more ought we to continue in praier?* By this exposition and collection of Cyprian wee may gather that no christian can erre iudicially, if that

were the intent of Christ his prayers to free the *Pope* from giuing any definitiue sentẽce against the faith, for Christ prayeth for all Christians and therfore we thus conclude.

He for whome Christ prayeth cannot erre:
But Christ prayeth for all true Christians:
Therefore no Christian can erre.

No papist I am assured will graunt the proposition seing the assumption cannot be denied, being so plainly auouched by Cyprian: but I proceed to the second Contradiction.

The 2. Contradiction.

The Papists nowe teach that the *Pope* is aboue a councel. *Qui tradunt* (saith the Turrian) *concilium esse supra papam illi naturæ repugnant, quum hoc nihil aliud sit, quam partem toti præferre. They that deliuer this doctrine that a councel is aboue a pope, crosse nature, seeing this is nothing else but to preferre a part before the whole.* If this be true, then the counsell of *Basill* opposeth it selfe to nature, for I finde it written in the 33. sessi- pag. 294.
on. *Veritas de protestate concilii generalis*

vniuersalem ecclesiam representantis, supra papam & quemlibet alterum declarata, per Constantiense, & hoc Basiliense generalia concilia, est veritas fidei Catholicæ. The truth of the power of a generall Councell, representing the vniuersall Church, aboue the Pope and euery other person, declared by the generall councells of Constance, and this of Basill, is the veritie of the Catholicke faith. And to retort Turrian his reason, thus may an argument be framed:

The whole is aboue the part:
But the general Councell is the whole representing the vniuersal Church:
Therefore it is aboue the Pope.

The 3. Contradiction.

The Papists teach that necessarie arguments may be drawne from traditions, coũcells, Popes decrees, and I know not what, and therefore wanting arguments against vs, obtrude their pelfe of traditions, which haue no warrant in the booke of God: yet Aquinas writeth otherwise, *Sacra doctri-*

na authoritatibus canonicæ ſcripturæ vtitur, ex neceſsitate argumentando, authoritatibus autem aliorum doctorum eccleſiæ quaſi arguendo non ex propriis, ſed probabilibus: Diuinitie vſeth the authoritie of the Canonicall ſcripture, arguing out of it by by neceſſarie arguments, but the authoritie of other church teachers, arguing as it were by proper, not by probable arguments. I wiſh the Papiſts would attend to their Angelical Doctor in this point, which he proueth ſoundly out of Auguſtine: *Solis enim ſcripturarum libris qui Canonici appellantur, didici hunc honorem deferre, vt nullum authorem eorum in ſcribendo erraſſe aliquid firmiſsimè credam.* For I haue learned to deferre this honour onely to the Canonicall Scriptures, to beleeue moſt ſteadfaſtly that no Author of them hath erred in any point. If this were the opinion of all papiſts, many controuerſies would be compounded betwixt them and vs, yet this is in truth to honour and reuerence the Scriptures, which were good for all papiſts, and not to diſgrace them as they doe.

parte 1. q. 1. art. 8. reſp. ad 2um.

The

The 4. Contradiction.

Præfat. Tobiæ. *Postquam auxiliante deo (saith Lyra) scripsi super libros Canonicos sacræ Scripturæ, incipiendo à principio Genes. & progrediendo vsque ad finem, eiusdem confisus auxilio super alios intendo scribere, qui non sunt de Canone, lib. Sapientiæ, Ecclesiastic. Iudith, Tobiæ, & Machabæorum, &c.* After that by Gods assistance I haue written vpon the bookes of Canonicall scripture, from the beginning of Genesis and so forward to the ende, trusting still vnto his helpe, I purpose to write vpon those that are not Canonical, as the booke of Wisdome, Ecclesiasticus, Iudith, Tobias, and the Maccabees. This is Lyra his opinion concerning these bookes, which he prooueth out of Hierom, and yet the Papists plead for them to be numbered amongst the Canonicall Scriptures, yea (as thou heardest before) Campian in his first reason prooueth that we distrust our cause, because we denie them to be of equall authoritie with the other bookes; I passe by the authoritie of other Papists, as namely Hugo

Hugo the Cardinall, and Caietan, who with Lyra cut theſe bookes from the bodie of the Bible, yet we may not doe ſo without hereſie, and accuſation of mayming the holy Scriptures; let them now turne their pennes againſt their owne fellowes. Here I might haue made an other article of diſſention about the corruption of Scriptures: for Lindanus and other *Papiſts* holde them to be corrupt, but the contrarie is learnedly taught by Iſacke, and Arrias Montanus, two famous Hebricians, and by Gods aſsiſtance I offer to defend it againſt all *Papiſts*, that are of another minde. Bellarmines reaſons are blowne away with a blaſt.

The 5. Contradiction.

There are ſo many opinions of *Papiſts* about marriage, that they themſelues are vncertaine what to hold. This is witneſſed by Melchior Canus, *lib. 8. cap. 5. fol. 245. in initio. Lege Magiſtrum, Diuum Thomam, Scotum, Bonavent. Richard. Paludan. Durandū, cæteroſque ſcholæ theologos, & niſi ſtatim pendentes & vacillantes eorum animos de-*

prehen-

prehẽderis, tum verò me aut stultum, aut temerarium iudicato, nam & cum quærunt, an matrimonium conferat gratiam, idque eo loco maximè finiendum erat, non definiunt tamen, sed in his referunt, quæ in hominum opinione posita sunt. In materia autẽ, & forma huius sacramẽti statuenda, adeò sunt inconstantes, & varii, adeò incerti, & ambigui, vt ineptus futurus sit, qui in tanta illorũ varietate, ac discrepantia, rem aliquam certam, constantem, & explorat am conetur efficere, quod si in forma, & materia sacramẽti, &c. Read the Master of Sentences, Saint Thomas, Bonaventure, Richardus Paludanus, Durandus, and the rest of the schoole diuines, and if forthwith thou doest not finde their wauering and doubtfull mindes, then iudge me either a foole or a rash fellow: for when they dispute whether matrimonie giueth grace, that which was especially to be determined, they doe not determine at all, but onely make relation of mens opinions, and in setting downe the matter and forme of this sacrament, they are so inconstant, so variable, so vncertaine, and

doubt-

doubtfull, that he shall be iudged indiscreete, who in such a varietie, and discent, goeth about to frame any certaine & constant matter. But if they be so doubtful about the matter, and forme of the sacrament, which is a matter of exceeding great moment &c. Thus the Papists bare witnesse one against auother, concerning their pretended sacrament of matriage: and whosoeuer readeth Bellarmine, out of this point, tom. 2. shal find more varietie.

The 6. Contradiction.

Peter Lumbard the master of sentences, teacheth that prtestes onely haue power to manifest and declare, that men are bound, & looſed frõ their sins: and therfore he is reprehended by Doctor Allen in his booke of the power of priesthood. I wil set downe their masters reasons: *Non ergo postmodum per sacerdotem, cui confitetur, ab ira æterna liberatur, à qua liberatus est per dominum, ex quo dixit confitebor, he is not afterward deliuered from æternall vvrath by the priest, to* Lib. 40. dist. 18.

vvhome

whome he maketh confession, from which he is deliuered by the Lord, euen then, vvhen he said I will confesse. His syllogisme is this.

He that is deliuered by the *Lord*, before his confession, is not absolued by the *Priest*.

But the repentant is deliuered by the *Lord* himselfe before his confession:

Therefore not by the *Priest*.

Next followeth Ambrose his testimonie. *Verbum dei dimittit peccata, sacerdos, & iudex, sacerdos quidem officium suum exhibet, sed nullius potestatis ius exercet. The vvord of God namely Iesus Christ forgiueth sinnes being Priest, and Iudge, the Priest indeede doeth his duetie, but hee practiseth not the right of any powver*: To Ambrose is adioyned S. Augustins saying. *Nemo tollit peccata nisi solus Deus: no man taketh away sinne but onely God*: Afterward in the same distinction he prooueth it, because the *Lord* first cleansed the *Leapers*, and then sent them to the Priests. Hee likewise first raised *Lazarus*, and then offred him to the disciples, & in the end after Hieroms notable testimony he cõcludeth thus, *Et in remittẽdis, vel in retinẽdis*

dis culpis id iuris & officii habent Evangelici ſacerdotes, quod olim habebant in lege legales in curandis leproſis, The Evangelical prieſts haue that power and office in forgiuing and retaining of ſiinnes which in times paſt the legall prieſtes had in curing of the lepers, nowe euery man knoweth that they did but declare them to be healed.

The 7. Contradiction.

Picus Mirandula in his firſt queſtion about Chriſt his deſcent into hell, affirmeth that, *Scotus in ſacris literis non parùm exercitatus dicit, quod ex ſacra ſcriptura non habetur, quod Chriſtus deſcenderit ad inferos: Scotus being well ſtudied in the Bible teacheth that it is not prooued out of the holie writte that Chriſt deſcended into hell*: yet it is notorious to ſee how the Papiſts do luſtely pull & hayle the Scriptures to prooue this matter. The ſame Picus in the before named queſtion, bringeth forth Durandus teſtimonie, firſt concerning his learning, and

then

then ſetting downe his wordes, *Videtur quod Chriſtus ſecundum animam non deſcenderit ad infernum, quia idem finitum non poteſt ſimul eſſe in diuerſis locis, ſed anima Chriſti cum eſſet creatura finita, & ſtatim poſt mortem fuit in paradiſo cũ anima latronis, cui dictum eſt Lucæ 23. hodie mecum eris in Paradiſo, ergo tunc ſaltem non potuit eſſe in miſeria.* It ſhould ſeeme that Chriſt in ſoule went not dovvne into hell, becauſe the ſame finit thing cãnot be at one time in many places: but the ſoule of Chriſt beeing a finit creature, was by and by after death in paradiſe, with the theeves ſoule, to vvhome it vvas ſaide Luke 23. this day thou ſhalt be with me in paradiſe: therefore then it could not be in hell. Againe, *Quæ Chriſtus fecit, & paſsus eſt in natura aſſumpta, ordinata fuerunt ad ſalutem humanam, ſed ad hanc non profuiſſet, quòd Chriſtus ad inferos deſcendiſſet quia per paſsionem quam Chriſtus in hoc mundo ſuſtinuit, liberauit nos ab omni culpa & pœna.* Thoſe things that Chriſt did, and ſuffered in his aſſumpted humane nature were ordained for mans ſaluation, but it

fur-

furthered not this that Christ went into hell, because by his passion which he suffred in this world, he deliuered vs from all guilt and punishment. The conclusion is that Christ descended not locally into hell, but by operation and effect.

The 3 Contradiction.

Melchior Canus in his 12. booke of common places and thirteene chapter, page 450 teacheth, that *in Christi voluntate intellectuali, (quæ propriè voluntas est) non tristitia modo sed summa & maxima fuit. In Christs intellectuall will, which is properly vvill, there vvas not onely sorrow but exceeding great heauinesse:* and this he prooueth thus, *In hostia pro peccato potissimum desideratur voluntatis tristitia, sacrificium quippe deo spiritus contribulatus, In the sacrifice for sinne is desired especially the sorrow of the will, for a troubled spirit is a sacrifice vnto god,* his syllogisme is this.

Christ offered the most acceptable sacrifice vnto God.

But the most acceptable sacrifice to God is sorow in the will: *Ergo*

Secondly he prooueth it because that Iesus Christ did those things for vs, which doe especially manifest his loue, but herein (namely in suffering in soule) is his loue especially manifested: *Ergo*, Other reasons for this purpose are alleadged by him, but in the ende hee concludeth, that *Christus* was *derelictus à deo, omniq; penitus destitutus solatio*, that Christ was forsaken of god, and altogether destitute of all comfort. If Caluin had written so, how should he haue beene reuiled and taunted by the papists? who accuse vs of blasphemie because that we say he suffered in soule. Notwithstanding Ferus vpon the 27. of Math. goeth further, and teacheth that *Christus desperationem piorum in se recepit*, Christ tooke vpon him the despaire of the godly. Yet nowe who knoweth not the contrarie is holde by the papists, namely, that *Christus non grauitate supplicium, sed actionum pondere iustitiæ diuinæ satisfecit*. that Christ satisfied Gods iustice not by sustaining any grieuous

punishment, but by the weight or excellencie of his actions.

The 9. Contradiction.

Aquinas in his 2.2 quæst. 91. *artic. secundo, responsione ad quartum*, writeth that, *instrumenta musica magis movent animum ad delectationem, quam vt per ea formetur interius bona dispositio.* Instruments of musicke do rather stirre vp the minde to delight, thē frame any good disposition in it, and answereth the Papists arguments brought for them. *In veteri Testamento vsus erat talium instrumentorum, tum quia populus erat magis durus, & carnalis, vnde erat per huiusmodi instrumenta provocandus, sicut & per promissiones terrenas, tum etiam quia huiusmodi instrumenta corporalia aliquid significabant.* In the olde Testament there was vse of such instruments becauſe the people were hard and carnall, whereby it

commeth to paſſe, that they were to be excited by ſuch inſtruments, as by earthly promiſes, and alſo becauſe ſuch corporall inſtruments did præſigne ſome thing. Howe this agreeth to Bellarmines defence of them, let the Papiſts themſelues iudge. The ſame Aquinas alſo in the ſame place ſaith, *Nobilior modus eſt provocandi homines ad devotionẽ per doctrinam & prædicationem, quàm per cantum. It is a more excellent kinde of way to excite and provoke the people to deuotion by doctrine and preaching, then by ſinging.* And therefore *prælati non debent cantibus inſiſtere ne per hoc à maioribus retrahantur. Prelates ought not to inſiſt in ſinging leaſt men by this thing ſhould be drawen from greater matters.*

The 10. Contradiction.

The Counſel of Baſill 36. ſeſsio: holdeth that the Virgin Mary was *Immunis ab omni peccato originali, free from all original ſinne:* and forbiddeth all men to preach the contrary. So do many more Papiſts hold, yet *A-*

quinas

quinas prooueth the contrarie 3. *part*. *quæst*. 27. *artic*. 2. first becauſe that *ſanctificatio non eſt niſi emundatio à peccato originali, culpa autem non poteſt emundari niſi per gratiam, cuius ſubiectum eſt ſola creatura rationalis. Sanctification is nothing els but a clenſing from originall ſinne, now ſinne cannot be purged but onely by grace, the ſubiect whereof is onely a reaſonable creature*. Secondly becauſe, *ſola creatura rationalis eſt ſuſceptiua culpæ, only a reaſonable creature is capable of ſinne*: if Mary had no ſinne, then ſhee ſhould haue needed no Sauiour: but Chriſt ſaued the people, and therefore Mary. Thus whiles the Papiſts pretende to honour Mary, and ſo Chriſt, they rob Chriſt of his glorie, and honour, which is to bee Maries ſauiour.

The II. *Contradiction.*

It is held by Papiſts that in Purgatorie ſatisfaction is made to God for mans ſinnes

but Aquinas telleth vs the contrary in his supplement, *quæst.* 5. *artic.* 3. for being vrged by this reason that *pœna purgatorii ad satisfactoria pro peccato, sed satisfactio habet efficaciam ex vi contritionis, ergo contritio manet post hanc vitam*: the punishment of purgatorie satisfyeth for sinne, but satisfaction hath his efficacy from contrition, therefore contrition indureth after this life. The force of this argument driueth him to this aunswere, *pœna illa quam animæ in purgatorio sustinent, non potest proprie dici satisfactio quia satisfactio opus meritorium requirit, the punishment which the soules sustaine in purgatory cannot properly be called satisfaction, because satisfaction requireth merit.* But there is no merit in purgatory: therefore no satisfaction. And if his argument in the same place be good that there is no sorrowe for sinnes in purgatorie, because *sacramenta non manent post hanc vitam, the sacraments indure not after this life.* Then is therfore no satisfaction in purgatory, because satisfaction is a part of their sacrament of penance, as well as contrition.

The 12. Contradiction.

Aquinas in his third *part. quæst.* 25. *articulo* 3. holdeth that, *Imago Christi est adoranda adoratione latriæ. The Image of Christ is to be worshipped with the same worship that Christ himselfe:* and prooueth it clarkly (I warrant you) out of Aristotle his booke *de memoria.* I will not stand to set downe his reason beeing fully answered by *Picus Mirandula*, that great learned man, to whome I referre the reader concerning this question. The contrary is held by many Papists, as may be seene in *Picus* before named, and in Bellarmine himselfe. Behold vnto what Idolatrie *Papists* are growen, to worshippe a creature with the same honour which is due to the Creator himselfe.

The 13. Contradiction.

In the Censure of Colon we are taught pag. 85.

a certaine vaine kinde of difference betwixt faith and hope. Faith (saith that Censure) is of generall propositions, as, *Quicunque crediderit, & baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit*: Whosoeuer beleeueth, and is baptized, shall be saued. But it is not of these propositions: *ergo ad vitam æternam ingrediar, aut mihi peccata remissa sunt*. I shall enter into life euerlasting, or my sinnes are forgiuen me. The Catechisme of Colon teacheth contrariwise, that *ad iustificationem requiritur, vt singuli credant sibi remissa peccata per Christum*: It is requisite to iustification that euery one beleeueth that his sinnes are forgiuen him by Christ; and prooueth the same by that excellent testimonie of Bernard. It is not sufficient to beleeue that thou canst not haue remission of sinnes, but by Gods mercie: and thou canst haue any good thing except God giueth thee it: and that thou canst not deserue eternall life by any workes, besides these which are but *initiũ fidei*, the beginning of faith. *Hoc etiam addendum, vt credas quòd per ipsum tibi peccata condonentur*: this moreouer is to be added,

pag. 139.

Serm. 1. de Eunuch.

added, that thou beleeuest that thy sinnes are forgiuen thee by God; and this is the testimonie which the holy Ghost doth assure thee of in thy heart, saying, thy sinnes are forgiuen thee. Out of this testimonie of Bernard, we may gather, that to thinke of the Popish faith the contrarie is cõstantly maintained by the Papists, namely, that no man is to beleeue the forgiuenesse of his sinnes, which doctrine is plainely confuted by their owne Catechisme, as we saide.

The 14. Contradiction.

Spes (saith the Master of sentences) *est cum fiducia expectatio futuræ beatitudinis, veniens ex dei gratia, & meritis præcedentibus*: Hope is an expectation of the blessednes to come with an affiance proceeding of Gods grace, and our precedent merits: yet the same Catechisme of Colon, pag. 138. and 140. placeth all our affiance in God his mercifull promise. But no more of this contra-

Lib. 3. dist. 26

rietie,

rietie, becauſe I haue ſpoken of it in the reaſon of diſſolute, and diſcomfortable doctrine.

The 15. Contradiction.

The ſame Catechiſme teacheth out of Bernard that we are iuſtified onely by faith, *hoc eſt non per merita propria, ſed per miſericordiam dei, quam ſola fides, accipit, & apprehendit*, that is, none by our owne merits, but by Gods mercie, which onely faith doth apprehend. What Proteſtant teacheth any otherwiſe? Bernard his words are theſe, *Qui ſquis pro peccatis compunctus, eſurit, & ſitit iuſtitiam, credat in te, qui iuſtificas impium, & ſolam iuſtificatus per fidem, pacem habebit apud Deum.* Whoſoeuer is pricked in his heart for his ſinnes, and hungreth and thirſteth after righteouſnes, let him beleeue in thee that iuſtifieth the vngodly man, and beeing iuſtified by onely faith, he ſhall haue peace with God. Here I might haue alſo alleadged the teſtimonie of Albertus Pighius for iuſtification by imputatiue righteouſnes. The ſame Catechiſme alſo fol. 85. teacheth

pag. 141.

Serm. 22 in Cantic.

cheth that iuſtifying faith is vnſeparable from hope and charitie, and anſwereth the place of the 1. to the Corinth. and 13. chap. by the teſtimonies of Chryſoſtome, Theophylact, Baſill, and Ambroſe: how well the papiſts agree in theſe 2. points with this their Catechiſme, let their owne writings witneſſe.

The 16. Contradiction.

Scotus in the firſt booke of ſentences, and 27. diſtinct. prooueth that good workes deſerue, *opera merentur tantùm ex pacto*, works deſerue onely by reaſon of God his couenant and promiſe. His argument is this, *Meritum non eſt niſi vbi eſt dignum: at non eſt dignũ reſpectu intrinſecarum actionũ*: there is no deſert but where there is a worthines: but in reſpect of our inward actions, there is no worthineſſe: *ergo*. His aſſumption is thus prooued, *tunc enim deus non poſſit non retribuere beatitudinem*, if there were any worthineſſe in the works themſelues, then God is bounde to giue vnto them happineſſe and bleſſednesſe: but God is not bounde. *Ergo*. Reade Bellarmine

in

in his 5. booke of iustification, and thou shalt not onely finde Scotus his opinion misliked, whose argument is vnanswerable, but Durandus also reprehended by Bellarmine, such is the harmony betwixt Papists in substantiall points of religion.

The 17. Contradiction.

Roffensis in his 32. article against Luther, agreeth with Luther about veniall sinne, namely that none is veniall of it own nature, but only by gods mercy, *Quod peccatum veniale solùm ex dei misericordia veniale sit, in hoc tecum sentio*: that a veniall sinne is only veniall through Gods mercy, therein I do agree vnto thee. Read more Papists of Roffensis his minde in Bellarmine *lib. 2. de purgat. cap. 4.* yet we know that Aquinas & generally all Papists do teach otherwise.

The 18. Contradiction.

Aquinas in his *prima 2. 109. quest. artic. 6.* teacheth that man without grace, cannot *vitare*

tare peccatum, auoide and eschew sinne; and answereth three reasons brought against this opinion. The first reason is thus framed. He that cannot auoide sinne but sinneth necessarily, sinneth not at all. The second argument is this, It followeth of this opinion that reprehensions are needlesse. Thirdly, & lastly Eccles. 15. it is said, that *ante hominem est vita, & mors*, before man is life and death. These three arguments are all answered by Aquinas, and yet they are the papists pillers of free-wil as euery man knoweth: if it were needfull I might quote the authors that vse them.

The 19. Contradiction.

Alexander de Hales *parte 4. quæst. 24.* denieth that confirmation was instituted by Christ: his reasons are these two, *Quia Christus quando instituit aliquod Sacramentum, determinat elementum*, when Christ doth institute any sacrament, hee determineth of the element, and matter of the Sacrament, but hee hath not done so in this Sacrament:

Er:

Ergo it was not instituted of him. Secondly, *in Sacramentis vna forma est*, *in the Sacraments there is one forme of words*, but in this there is not one forme of wordes; for in diuers churches they haue diuers formes: *Ergo* it was not instituted of Christ. Hence it may be concluded that it is no sacrament, because all Sacraments were ordained by Christ Iesus, as Aquinas holdeth 3. *parte*, *quæst.* 72. *art.* 1. *resp. ad primum*, where also wee may see that some held, (as Alexander de Hales holdeth) namely, that it was not instituted of Christ, and by consequent it is no Sacrament.

The 20. Contradiction.

The Contradictions about the Sacrament of the alter, and reall presence are so manie, that I will not enter into them, because I eschew tediousnesse, onely I will set downe Aquinas his opinion in his supplement, 83. *quæst. art.* 3. *responsione ad quartum*: namely that on body cannot bee locally in two places at one time, for it implyeth a Contradiction,

ction, but now the *Papists* care not for Contradiction: so they may make the bodie of Christ present locally in the Sacrament. Many more Contradictions might I haue set downe, as namely the certaine knowledge that a man is in grace, and such like taught by *Papists*, but it shall suffice to haue proued that in the weightiest points of controuersie the Papists are on our side. Let them now bragge no more of vnitie, for the spirite of dissention is sowen amongst them. Did euer the Caluinists teach the weightiest points of poperie, as the papists do the greatest opinions of Caluinisme? I know they doe not. Thus leauing this reason to the indifferent reader to iudge of, euery man may see what cause there is to disclaime and renounce the Romish religion.

The

The twelue reason of the Originall of many things taught & held in Poperie.

FOr asmuch as in one of my former reasons I haue by sufficient testimonies proued the practise of the primitiue Church to bee repugnant to Poperie in many weightie matters, I shal not need to be long in the Original of the Romish religion, certaine it is that it was not all hatched at once, and that it it not a thing necessarie to shew the beginning of euerie point in poperie, seing that *ipsa Papistarum doctrina cum Apostolis comparata ex diuersitate, & contrarietate sua pronunciabit, neque Apostoli alicuius authoris esse, neque Apostolici. The Popish doctrine it selfe being compared with the Apostles will by the varietie and contrarietie that is in it, pronounce that neither Apostle*

Tert. de præscrip.

Apostle, nor any Apostolicall man was the author of it. Notwithstanding both because it helpeth much for the satisfying of some, and also because diuerse abuses are noted by Papists thẽselues, I will set downe some things concerning the Originall of poperie; and first heare what Bucchingerus an arch Papist in his Ecclesiastical history writeth, pag. 217. *Res est plena horroris vel legere, vel meminisse, tantam tyrannidem, inter se exercuisse mutuò Pontifices Romanos: ô quantum degenerarunt à maioribus suis! & fieri non potuit in tanta crudelitate, vt pietatis Christianæ ratio haberetur, ne cui mirum sit interim, si qui abusus & perversæ opiniones in Ecclesiam irrepserunt.* It is a thing full of horror either to reade or to remember the great tyranny the Bishops of Rome haue practised one toward another: ô howe are they degenerate from their auncestoures! and it cannot be that in such crueltie their should be had any regard of Christian piety: let no man then marueile if some abuses, and badde opinions haue crept into the church. Loe here three things noted by a Papist him

selfe. First the cruelty of the Romish Bishops, 2. their degeneratiõ from their auncestours, and thirdly that certaine badde opinions by this meanes are crept into the Church. For proofe of this last point, I will beginne with purgatory, because that it hath warmed the popes kitchin. Concerning which let Rofensis a papist speake, *artic. 18. contra assert. Lutheri, fer in ini. sed Græcis etiam adhunc vsque diem, non creditum est purgatorium esse: legat quicunque velit Græcorum veterũ commentarios & nullum (quantum opinor) aut quàm rarissimum de purgatorio sermonem inveniet. Sed neque Latini simul omnes huius rei veritatem concepêrunt*, & rursus, *non absque maxima spiritus sancti dispensatione factum est, quòd post tot annorum curricula, purgatorii fides, & indulgentiarũ vsus, ab orthodoxis generatim sit receptus, quàndiu nulla fuit de purgatorio cura, nemo quæsivit indulgentias, nam ex illo pendet omnis indulgentiarum existimatio*. The Greeks to this daie doe not beleeue that there is purgatory, reade who list the Commentaries of the auncient Græcians

cians, and he shall finde either very seldome mention of purgatory, or none at all. Neither did the Latin Church conceiue the trueth of this thing at one time. *And againe*, neither was it done without the great dispensation of the holy ghost that after so many yeares, Catholikes both beleeued purgatory, and receiued the vse of pardon generally, so long as there was no care of purgatory, no man sought for pardons, for of it dependeth all the æstimation that we haue of pardons. Out of this testimony I gather first that the Greeke Church acknowledgeth no purgatory. Secondly that the auncięt Latin Church did not beleeue it. Thirdly, that these opinions grewe by little and little in the Church. Fourthly and lastly that pardons depende vpon purgatorie, and so are newe deuises of mans braine. Therefore let pardons & purgatory pickpurse goe. From purgatory I passe to the *Popes* primacy, which is an after invention (as I prooue out of Socrates in the 7. booke of his Ecclesiasticall historie, and the 11. chap.) *Episcopatus Romanus non aliter atque Alexandrinus,*

quasi extra sacerdotii fines egressus ad sæcularem principatum iam erat ante delapsus. The Bishops of Rome and Alexandria going beyond the limits of priesthood, vvent into a secular & worldly dominiõ. For proofe of this, when Victor [as Eusebius writeth *lib. 5. cap.* 23. Ecclesiastic. histor.] would haue excommunicated the Churches of Asia, he was resisted by Iræneus. To passe ouer that, Policarpus would not yeeld to Amcetus. We know that before Boniface the first no Bishop of Rome was called vniuersal bishop. Lastly as testifieth (*Fasciculus temporum*) *anno* 704, in Gregory the second his daies, *Domini Papæ plus solito erant in temporalibus, The popes grewe more in temporall matters then they vvere vvoont.* Thirdly, concerning ministers marriage, Bucchingerus (before named) saith, pag. 104, that *Calixtus nemini in sacris ordinib. constituto, licere superducere vxorem, connubialique vinculo se constringere statuit.* decreed that no man being in holy orders might marry a wife & bind himselfe with the marriage bõd. Iohãnes Maierius in his book, *de differẽtiis schismatum*

matum, *pag.* 136. professeth his ignorance in this point, namely, who did first prohibite it, yet saith, that some referre it to Calixtus vpon these ridiculous, and barbarous verses.

O bone Calixte nunc omnis clerus odit te,
Olim presbyteri poterant vxoribus vti,
Hoc aestruxisti quando tu Papa fuisti.
Ergo tuum festum nunquam celebratur honestum.

O Calixtus thou art hated of all the cleargie, priests might marry in times past, which thou didst take away being Pope, therefore thy festiuall day is not honorably celebrated. Others referre it to Syricius the Pope: certaine it is, that it was not from the Apostles, (as is proued out of Gratian: *part.* 1. *distinct.* 56. *Cenomanensem.*) *Coniugia sacerdotibus ante prohibitionem vbique erant licita, & in Orientali Ecclesia vsque hodiè licere probatur, Mariage of ministers was lawfull before the prohibition thereof, and in the East churches they are lawfull vnto this day.* See Polydore Virgill in his fift booke *de inuentoribus rerum*, when it was restrained in the West churches. Howsoeuer it is not certen

who first restrained the marriage of ministers, yet it is certaine that, Calixtus *instituit ieiunium quatuor temporum*, *appointed the fast of the foure times*, namely in March, May, September, and December, Bucchingerus in the same place. Fiftly, Innocentius the first, *anno* 404. *statuit, quòd non solum presbyteri, sed omnes Christiani deberent vngi oleo infirmorum*, decreed that not onely Presbyters, but al Christians ought to be annointed with the oyle of the sick. *Fasciculus temporum, folio* 50. *Ergo*, extreame vnction is no Sacrament, being inuented, and deuised by a Pope. Sixtly, *anno* 654. *Festum purificationis institutum fuit*, the feast of the purification of Marie was instituted. *Fasciculus temporũ, folio* 55. Seuenthly, *anno* 654. *Vitellianus cãtum organorum instituit*, Pope Vitellian ordeined Organes in the church. *Fasciculus temp. fol.* 60. Eightly, *anno* 614. *Bonifacius instituit festum omnium sanctorum*, ordainned the feast of al Saints. *Fasciculus temp. fol.* 58. Ninthly, *anno* 484. *Festum visitationis Mariæ institutum fuit ab Vrbano*, The feast of the visitation of Marie was ordained by Vrba-

Vrbanus. *Fasciculus temp fol.* 86. Tenthly, *Festi dies instituti sunt à Fælice primo*, festiuall daies were instituted of Fælix the first. Bucchingerus 130. pag. Eleuenthly, *Pelagius horas canonicas instituit*, Pelagius appointed canonicall howers. *Idē pag.* 167. Twelfly, *Gregorius primus Letaniam auxit*, Gregory the first increased the Letanie. *Idem pag* 173. And because I might abound in these particulars, read this author, and thou shalt finde the Originall, of euery thing almost in their Masse: the worshipping of Images was not concluded (as Alfonsus witnesseth) before the Councell of Nice. Transubstantion in the Laterane Councell was determined vnder Pope Iulius. Iuell in the defence of the Apologie pag. 35. the cupp was taken from the people by the Councell of Constance. But these shall suffice to shew the Originall of poperie: by them euery man may iudge of the rest, neither let any man say these are trifles. For the Popes primacie, purhatorie, mariage of ministers, extreame vnction, images, transubstantiation, and the cuppe are matters of exceeding great moment. And for a con-

clusion (christian Reader) I saye with the Orator, in his 2. booke *de natura Deorum, si singula hæc te non mouent, vniuersa tamen inter se connexa, & coniuncta monere debent.* If euery one of these seuerally can not moue and perswade thee to relinquish poperie, yet all of them ioyned and coupled together ought to perswade thee.

FINIS.